Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BS2320 .J77
Jones, Jeremiah, 1693-1724. MAIN
A new and full method of settling the ca
3 9967 00125 2647

S0-GEZ-657

ACCESSION NUMBER 6636

SHELF NUMBER BS2320 J77

The Virginia Library

McCormick

Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the Corning Fund.

RECEIVED

A

NEW AND FULL

METHOD

OF SETTLING

THE CANONICAL AUTHORITY

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

TO WHICH IS SUBJOINED

A VINDICATION OF THE FORMER PART

OF

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL,

FROM MR. WHISTON'S CHARGE OF DISLOCATIONS.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

BY

THE REV. JEREMIAH JONES.

McCormick LIBRARY Theological Seminary

VOL. III.

OXFORD,
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.
MDCCCXXVII.

193

McCormick
LIBRARY
Theological Seminary

A

METHOD

FOR

SETTLING THE CANON

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

PART IV.

A general dissertation, or proof, concerning the canonical authority of the four Gospels.

BEFORE I enter upon the proof of the canonical authority of each of the Gospels in particular, it will be very serviceable to my design to observe and shew, that *the primitive Christians have expressly acknowledged only four Gospels; and those four Gospels which we now receive under the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, to be genuine and canonical.* I shall produce the several testimonies which I have observed, according to the order of time in which the writers lived; and among these it will not be amiss to place,

1. St. JOHN.

I. The testimony of St. John the apostle; concerning whom we are told by Eusebius[a], "That when the three Gospels (of "Matthew, Mark, and Luke) were published and known to "every body, St. John at length saw them, approved them, "and confirmed the truth of them; but [owned] that they

[a] Τῶν προαναγεγραφέντων τριῶν εἰς πάντας ἤδη καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν διαδεδομένων, ἀποδέξασθαι μὲν φασὶν ἀληθειαν αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρήσαντα· μόνην δὲ ἄρα λείπεσθαι τῇ γραφῇ τὴν περὶ τῶν ἐν πρώτοις καὶ κατ' ἀρχὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πεπραγμένων διήγησιν—Παρακληθέντα δὴ οὖν τούτων ἕνεκα φησὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην, τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν προτέρων εὐαγγελιστῶν παρασιωπηθέντα χρόνον, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοῦτον πεπραγμένα τῷ Σωτῆρι (ταῦτα δ' ἦν τὰ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ καθείρξεως) τῷ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελίῳ παραδοῦναι. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24.

" were defective as to the account of those things which were " done by our Saviour at the beginning of his ministry—— " For which reason John, being desired by his friends, sup- " plied the defects of the three others, and wrote his Gospel " to inform us of that time, and the things which were done by " our Saviour in it, viz. before the imprisonment of John the " Baptist." Now hence it follows,

1. That before St. John wrote his Gospel, the Christians of that first age owned and received no other than the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; although it is certain there were many other false Gospels extant at that time, as I have elsewhere proved.

2. That these three were universally received and approved.

3. That they were with just reason so approved, because St. John also did approve them.

Besides this testimony of Eusebius, I find in a very old book, entitled, Μαρτύριον Τιμοθέου τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, i. e. *the Martyrdom of Timothy the Apostle*, of which we have an extract in Photius, (Cod. 254;) " That when, after the death of Domi- " tian, Nerva became emperor, John returned to Ephesus, " from which place he had been banished by Domitian, he then " took the several books which contained the history of our " Saviour's sufferings and miracles and doctrines, and were " now translated into several different languages, reviewed " them, rectified them, and joined himself to the former three " evangelists (by writing his Gospel)." I confess I cannot certainly determine the age of this book. There is a book extant, entitled, *the Martyrdom of Timothy*, which goes under the name of Polycrates, a bishop of Ephesus, in the latter end of the second century, out of which Photius seems to have made this extract; and if this be true, it makes the history more valid: but it must be owned that several learned men are of opinion this book was not made by Polycrates, into which it is not my business here to inquire.

2. St. Polycarp.

II. The testimony of Polycarp, who, according to Irenæus [b],

[b] Καὶ Πολύκαρπος δὲ οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς, καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν

" was not only instructed by the apostles, and acquainted with " many who had seen Christ, but placed by the apostles in " Asia, as bishop of Smyrna, whom," says he, " I also saw " when I was young." He (Polycarp) expressly mentions together our four Gospels and their authors thus: " [c] It was not " without reason that the evangelists began their Gospels dif- " ferent ways; though the design of each of them was the same. " Matthew, because he wrote to the Hebrews, began with the " genealogy of Christ, that he might evidence Christ to be de- " scended of that family, which all the prophets had foretold " he should descend from. John being fixed among the " Ephesians, who as Gentiles were ignorant of the law, began " his Gospel with an account of the cause of our redemption, " viz. that God would have his Son become incarnate for our " salvation. Luke begins with the priesthood of Zacharias, " that by the account of his son's miraculous birth, and his " being so considerable a preacher, he might evidence the di- " vinity of Christ to the Gentiles. Mark began his Gospel " with the explication of some ancient prophecies relating to " the coming of Christ, that his Gospel might appear no new " thing, but the same as had been of old." For this fragment of Polycarp we are obliged to Feuardentius, who in his notes on Irenæus, l. 3. c. 3. published it with some other fragments of Polycarp out of a very ancient manuscript of Victor Capuanus's Catena, upon the four Evangelists, which Catena he there promises to publish; but whether he did or no, I know not. Victor Capuanus lived, according to Feuardentius, in the year of Christ 480. Johan. Jacob. Grynæus (Præfat. in Orthodoxographa) places him sooner, viz. A. D. 455; but Bellar-

Ασίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἑωράκαμεν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμῶν ἡλικίᾳ. Adv. Hæres. l. 3. c. 3. et apud Euseb. l. 4. c. 14.

[c] Rationabiliter Evangelistæ principiis diversis utuntur, quamvis una eademque evangelizandi eorum probetur intentio. Matthæus, ut Hebræis scribens, genealogiæ Christi ordinem texuit, ut ostenderet ab ea Christum descendisse progenie, de qua eum nasciturum universi prophetæ cecinerant. Joannes autem ad Ephesum constitutus, qui legem tanquam ex Gentibus ignorabant, a causa nostræ redemptionis Evangelii sumpsit exordium; quæ causa ex eo apparet, quod Filium suum Deus pro nostra salute voluit incarnari. Lucas vero a Zachariæ sacerdotio incipit, ut ejus filii miraculo nativitatis, et tanti prædicatoris officio, divinitatem Christi gentibus declararet. Unde et Marcus antiqua prophetici mysterii competentia adventui Christi declarat, ut non nova, sed antiquitus prolata ejus prædicatio probaretur.

mine[d] and Dr. Cave[e] place him near a hundred years later, viz. in the year 540, and 545, as also does Dr. Mill[f].

3. Tatian.

III. That there were only the four Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, received in the middle part of the second century, is evident from Tatian's Harmony, *which was made about that time.* He was a scholar of Justin Martyr, and συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεὶς, τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν· ὁ καὶ παρά τισιν εἰσέτι νῦν φέρεται (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 29.) "compiled a certain "harmony of the Gospels, and called it, *the Gospel of the* "*Four:* which is even to this day in the hands of some." The same account is also in Epiphanius, Hæres. 46. n. 1. There can be no reasonable doubt but that these four were the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; for not only the number agrees, but these were the only four Gospels that ever were reduced to a harmony. Besides, if the above mentioned Victor Capuanus is to be credited, the Harmony of Tatian is still extant; for that which he published in the fifth or sixth century, with a preface to prove it was wrote by Tatian, we have now printed among the Orthodoxographa[g]; and this contains our present four Gospels, and no other. But I must own that I question much, whether this be the work of Tatian or no; for the genealogy of Christ is in this Harmony of Tatian[h], which was not in the ancient one under his name[i].

It may indeed be objected that Victor Capuanus, in his preface to that which he thought to be the Harmony of Tatian, says, that "he gave his work the title of Diapente[k]. I find," says he, "by the history of Eusebius, that Tatian, a very "learned man and excellent orator of that time, compiled one "Gospel out of the four, to which he gave the title of Dia-"pente," i. e. *of five;* or, *the Gospel of Five:* as though he

[d] De Scriptor. Eccles. ad voc.
[e] Hist. Liter. tom. 1. p. 411.
[f] Prolegom. in Nov. Testam. §. 351.
[g] Vol. 1. p. 659, &c.
[h] See chap. 5. Orthodoxogr. p. 663.
[i] This I have observed already, vol. 1. part 2. ch. 39. p. 340.
[k] Ex historia quoque ejus (scil. Eusebii) comperi, quod Tatianus, vir eruditissimus, et orator illius temporis clarissimus, unum ex quatuor compaginaverit evangelium, cui titulum Diapente imposuit. Orthodoxogr. p. 659.

had made his Harmony out of five Gospels. Accordingly, I find that Grotius[l] has explained the word *Diapente*; "Tatian," says he, "when he made one Gospel out of four, followed not only the Greek, but the Hebrew copies of Matthew; whence it came to pass that his work, which was commonly called Διὰ Τεσσάρων, or *the Gospel of Four*, was by others called *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, by others Διὰ Πέντε, or *the Gospel of Five*."

To this I answer, (1.) That though I question not but Tatian made use of the Hebrew copies of St. Matthew, yet he made use of them as what he looked upon to be the most authentic and genuine, and so made no use of the Greek, as of another or fifth Gospel. This is what I have conjectured, and endeavoured to prove in the first volume[m]; but all which can be concluded hence is, that by a mistake he made use of an interpolated corrupt translation of St. Matthew, instead of the true Greek original, still looking upon it as the work of that evangelist, which is sufficient to my purpose.

2. As to Grotius's conjecture, that it was called Διὰ Πέντε, or *the Gospel of Five*, for the above mentioned reason, it seems to me entirely to be founded upon a false reading; and that instead of Διὰ Πέντε we are to read in the preface of Victor Διὰ Τεσσάρων, as is well conjectured by Mr. Fabricius[n]. My reasons for this correction are,

1. That Victor in his preface says, he found the account which he gives in the history of Eusebius; *but there is no such thing to be found in Eusebius;* but on the contrary he saith, "Tatian gave his work the title of Διὰ Τεσσάρων," i. e. *the Gospel of Four*. Either therefore Victor Capuanus was mistaken, or else we must correct his words by those of Eusebius, from whom he transcribed; i. e. for Διὰ Πέντε, must read Διὰ Τεσσάρων; *the Gospel of Four*, and not *the Gospel of Five*.

2. If Victor Capuanus had thought any thing of five Gospels being in Tatian's work, he would not have said expressly,

[l] Puto autem Tatianum, cum ex quatuor evangeliis unum concinnaret, secutum in Matthæi verbis non Græcos tantum, sed et Hebræos codices, unde evangelium illud quod vulgo Διὰ Τεσσάρων, *per Quatuor*, ab aliis dictum *secundum Hebræos*, ab aliis vero Διὰ Πέντε, *per Quinque*. Annot. in Titul. Matth.

[m] Loc. jam citat. p. 388, 389.

[n] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. tom. 1. p. 379.

Unum ex quatuor compaginaverit Evangelium, "He compiled "one out of four Gospels."

3. Theodoret (who lived in or not long before the time of Victor Capuanus, viz. about the year of Christ 450.) tells us, "He composed a Gospel Τὸ Διὰ Τεσσάρων καλούμενον," i. e. which was called *the Gospel of Four* [o].

Upon the whole then I conclude, there were but four Gospels, viz. those of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, in use in the church in the time of Tatian, i. e. in the time of Justin Martyr, who was Tatian's master.

4. Irenæus.

IV. Irenæus, who was contemporary with Tatian, has abundantly evidenced, that *there were no more than the four Gospels*, which we now receive, *then received in the church*. He has wrote a large chapter [p], entitled, A Proof that there can neither be more nor less than four Gospels; out of all which I shall only observe these two things; (1.) That he says the very heretics owned them and cited them [q]; (2.) He calls them vain, ignorant, and impudent, who assert, that there are either more or fewer than these four Gospels [r]. The fact therefore, which I am upon, being thus certain, I do not think myself obliged to say any thing concerning the allegorical arguments, which Irenæus makes use of to prove his point. Mr. Toland has bantered them [s], and Mr. Fabricius has shewn [t] that there is the like sort of reasoning upon that head in many of the ancient Christian writers; but, (as Du Pin says [u],) "These sort "of allegories have no other foundation but mere fancy; and "it is in vain to seek for any other reason of the number four, "than God's own will."

[o] Hæretic. Fabul. lib. 1. c. 20. Besides all I have said on this head, it may not be amiss to add the great Casaubon's conjecture, or correction of this place, viz. That for Διὰ Πέντε we should read Διὰ Πάντων, meaning that the title imported, the Gospel of all the Four, or the whole entire Gospel. Ad Baron. Annal. ann. 31. n. 3.

[p] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 11. Ostensio quod neque plura, nec minus quam quatuor possunt esse evangelia.

[q] Ut et ipsi hæretici testimonium reddant eis, et ex ipsis egrediens unusquisque eorum conetur suam confirmare doctrinam. lib. 3. c. 11.

[r] Vani omnes, et indocti, et insuper audaces, qui frustrantur speciem evangelii, et vel plures quam dictæ sunt, vel rursus pauciores inferunt personas evangelii. Ad eund. loc.

[s] Amyntor, p. 50, &c.

[t] Cod. Apocr. N. T. tom. 1. p. 382, &c. et tom. 3. p. 555, &c.

[u] Hist. of the Can. vol. 2. c. 2. §. 2.

5. Tertullian.

V. Tertullian has expressly determined *the number of Gospels*, which were received by the church in his time, *to four*. So, (l. 4. *adv. Marcion.* c. 2.) *Nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant;* i. e. "The credit of the Gospel history is confirmed to "us by two that were apostles, viz. Matthew and John, and "two that were apostolic men, (i. e. companions of the apo-"stles,) Mark and Luke:" and in the same book, c. 5. speaking of the same four Gospels, and naming them, he says, *Eadem auctoritas ecclesiarum apostolicarum cæteris quoque patrocinabatur evangeliis;* i. e. that "they were patronized or "confirmed by the authority of the apostolic churches."

6. Clemens Alexandrinus.

VI. Clemens Alexandrinus (not long after Irenæus) is the next, whose testimony I shall produce; he, disputing against Julius Cassianus, who had cited a passage out of the Gospel of the Egyptians in favour of the doctrine of the unlawfulness of marriage, replies; "First," says he, "I observe this is not in "either of the four Gospels delivered to us, but in the Gospel "according to the Egyptians[x];" by which he, who knows that Clemens continually cites the four Gospels which we now receive, and no other, will be easily induced to believe he here meant the same four. See the place at large above, Vol. I. Part II. Chap. XVI. p. 177.

7. Origen.

VII. Origen, the scholar of Clemens Alexandrinus, has also confirmed the same; viz. that "though there were many Gos-"pels forged by the heretics, which," says he, "we read, that "we may not be thought ignorant, *ecclesia quatuor habet* "*Evangelia*, i. e. the church receives only four Gospels[y];" and a little after, *Quatuor tantum Evangelia sunt prolata, e quibus sub persona Domini et Salvatoris nostri proferenda sunt dogmata;* "There are only four Gospels made use of, "out of which the articles of our religion as from Jesus Christ "are to be proposed." Once more a few lines after: *In his omnibus nihil aliud probamus nisi quod ecclesia, i. e. quatuor*

[x] Stromat. lib. 3. p. 465.

[y] Homil. in Luc. i. 1.

tantum Evangelia recipienda; "Among all these Gospels we "approve none but those which the church approves; viz. that "only the four Gospels are to be received." It would be madness for any one, who ever saw Origen's works, to ask what four Gospels he meant. Besides that, he elsewhere τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, speaking of, or *reciting the canon of the church*, names these four Gospels, ἃ καὶ μόνα ἀναντίῤῥητά ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. "which four alone "are received without controversy in the church of God, which "is all over the world." Comment. in Matth. apud Euseb. H. E. l. 6. c. 25.

8. Eusebius.

VIII. Eusebius (who lived in the beginning of the fourth century) expressly excludes all other Gospels from the canon besides those four which we now receive, but places them among the books which were without any controversy received by the consent of the whole church [z].

9. Athanasius.

IX. In the Synopsis under the name of Athanasius, the author tells us, that all "the Gospels which are read by any, are "rather fit to be concealed than read, except the four alone "which have been delivered to us."

10. Ambrose.

X. This father, in his preface to his Commentary on Luke, has almost transcribed Origen's words on the same place; accordingly he saith, "that though the heretics have many gos-"pels, the church hath only four," &c.[a]

11. Jerome.

XI. In the preface to his Translation of the Gospels he mentions some false gospels, viz. those of Lucianus and Hesychius, (see above, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XXII.) and promises, "he will only be concerned with four, which," says he, "are in the following order, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and "John [b]."

It would be endless to cite the many numerous proofs that may be easily produced out of the fathers of the fourth cen-

[z] Vid. Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 24, 25. et alibi passim.

[a] Proœm. Comment. in Luc. in init.

[b] Præfat. in Evang. ad Damasum.

tury. He that has a mind may see further proof of this matter, in the places of Epiphanius [c], Jerome [d], Chrysostom [e], and Austin [f], which are cited in the margin, and in the several catalogues of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, that of the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Austin, Ruffin, that of the third council of Carthage, and the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, which I have collected in the first volume, Part I. Ch. VIII. p. 54, &c.

CHAP. I.

Who Matthew was. Heracleon, Origen, and Grotius, mistaken in supposing Matthew and Levi to be the names of two persons. He was a Jew. In what countries he preached, and where he died: mentioned in the Talmud. The occasion of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel.

BEFORE I come to the Gospels themselves, and the proof of their authority, it seems to me necessary that some account be given of the author. Accordingly, I shall now begin with some short relations or accounts concerning St. Matthew, the author of this Gospel. Besides what we have in the canonical Gospels, there is not much that can be depended upon now left concerning him. The popish legends, and the fabulous writers of later ages, will afford us accounts sufficiently particular; but disregarding all these, I shall only mention such things as seem to be more credible, and built upon better foundations. The account we have of him in his Gospel is, that *Jesus at Capernaum saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and said unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him.* Matt. ix. 9. The other evangelists (viz. Mark ii. 14. and Luke v. 27, 28.) relate the same history; only they, instead of Matthew, give him the name of Levi, which seems to have been his surname, or another name, by which he was

[c] Hæres. 51. §. 4, &c.

[d] Præf. in Comm. in Matth. Comm. in Ezek. l. 10 et Epist. ad Paulin. de stud. Scriptur. This last Epistle is commonly prefixed to the Vulgate.

[e] In Matth. i. N. B. Theophylact has, according to his old custom, transcribed this of Chrysostom concerning the four evangelists' agreement, which I refer to, into his preface on Matthew.

[f] De Consens. Evangel. lib. 1. c. 2. 6. et Tract. 36. in Joan.

as commonly called. It is a thing well known, that the Jews were wont to call a person by more names than one; e. g. Moses's father-in-law is called Jethro, Exod. iii. 1. and Num. x. 29. he is called Hobab; and David's son, who is called 2 Sam. iii. 3. Chileab, goes under the name of Daniel, 1 Chron. iii. 1. Simon was also called Peter, Matt. x. 2. Lebbeus was surnamed Thaddeus, ver. 3, &c. which surname, or second name, seems to have been added to distinguish them from others, who had the same first name. I have mentioned this, because some, both ancient and modern writers, have imagined Matthew and Levi to have been two different persons: thus Heracleon, an early heretic of the second century, and a remarkable person in the school of Valentinus, speaking of those disciples of Christ, who were not called to a public acknowledgment or confession of Christ (by martyrdom), names Matthew, Philip, Thomas, and Levi [g]; and Origen, discoursing particularly of Christ's apostles, first mentions Matthew the publican, and afterwards names Levi the publican, but denies him to have been an apostle; Ἔστω δὲ καὶ ὁ Λεβὴς τελώνης ἀκολουθήσας τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἀλλ' οὔτι γε τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ ἦν, εἰ μὴ κατά τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων τοῦ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίου [h], "Levi also the publican, "who followed Jesus, but was not of the number of his apo-"stles, unless [we follow] some copies of Mark's Gospel." Among the moderns, Grotius is of this opinion [i]; but it is easy to refute it, by observing not only that the *circumstances of the fact are so exactly the same as related* by the three evangelists, but that *they agree precisely as to the time*, and all that which happened immediately before and after his call by Christ, viz. all the three evangelists agree, that this call was as our Saviour was going out of Capernaum immediately after the curing of the paralytic: and the several histories, which St. Matthew relates to have happened after his call by Christ, (viz. that Christ went *to eat with publicans and sinners, the Pharisees censuring him for it, his justification of himself, the disciples of John coming to Christ with a question about fasting, Christ's answer*, &c.) are all related by St. Mark and St. Luke after the call of Levi; and this affords us the highest evidence,

[g] Apud Clem. Alexand. Stromat. l. 4. p. 502.

[h] Adv. Cels. l. 1. p. 48.

[i] Annot. in Matt. ix. 9.

that Matthew and Levi were the same person. It is strange indeed that Heracleon and Origen should fall into such a mistake; but this is very rationally accounted for by Cotelerius[k] and Mr. Dodwell[l]; to whom, together with Dr. Whitby's[m] remarks on this opinion of Grotius, I refer the reader, who has a mind to examine further into this matter.

The two names of this evangelist, as also that of his father, (viz. Alpheus, Mark ii. 14.) evince him to have been originally a Jew, (it being certain that the Romans very frequently put the natives of the conquered provinces into such offices, under the principal officers who were generally Romans,) although I observe, that in two ancient manuscripts which Cotelerius (*in Constit. Apostol.* l. 2. c. 63.) has published out of the French king's library, N°. 1789. and 1026. which recite the country and parents of the twelve apostles, there is the following account of Matthew, Ματθαῖος ὁ καὶ Λευὶς, τελώνης τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα, ἐκ πατρὸς Ῥούκου, μητρὸς δὲ Χαιροθείας, ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, i. e. "Matthew, called also Levi, a publican, whose father was "Rucus, and mother Chærotheia, born in Galilee;" both which are plainly Gentile names.

After he was called to be an apostle, he continued in that office till our Saviour's ascension in Judæa; and if there be any credit to be given to the accounts of the ancients, he continued there eight years afterward; whither he then went is not certain: Ruffin[n] affirms that he went into Ethiopia, and in this he is followed by the writers of succeeding ages, Socrates, Simeon Metaphrastes, Abdias Babylonicus, &c. which last has given us a very particular account of his preaching, miracles, and success in the conversion of multitudes there; his building a church there, (viz. at Nadabbar, the capital city,) and calling it the Resurrection, because the raising of the son of king Æglippus from the dead was the occasion of it. [o]He preached Christ in Hierapolis, a city of Syria, and suffered martyrdom there, according to a Greek manuscript under the name of Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, (who lived in the beginning of the fourth century,) which was transcribed by Mr. Dodwell, and

[k] Annot. in Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 22.

[l] Dissert. 1. in Iren. §. 24.

[m] Annot. on Luke v. 27. See also Dr. Mill on Mark ii. 14.

[n] Hist. Eccl. l. 1. c. 9.

[o] Vid. Abdiæ Histor. Certam. Apostol. l. 7. per tot.

by him given to Dr. Cave, who has published it with a Latin version, and some notes upon it[p]; though, according to the common editions of the Synopsis of Dorotheus, he died a natural death, and was buried with great honour at Hierapolis, a city of Parthia[q]; and this, viz. his dying without martyrdom, is plainly intimated in the passage of Heracleon above cited out of Clemens Alexandrinus. I have nothing further to add under this head, but that which the father last cited tells us of St. Matthew's great temperance and abstemiousness, viz. *that he eat no flesh, but that his usual food was acorns, seeds, and herbs*[r]; and that, according to Dr. Lightfoot[s], there is mention of him in the *Talmud Bab. Sanhedr.* fol. 43. 1. The rabbins say, that Jesus had five disciples, which are there called by them מתאי נקאי נצר זבוני ותודה viz. Matthai, (or Matthew,) Nakai, Nezer, and Boni, and Thodah. These (they say there) were all punished with death. By these five disciples Dr. Lightfoot supposes they meant those disciples who were most conversant in Judæa, viz. Matthew, who wrote his Gospel there, Peter, James, John, and Jude[t].

The cause or occasion of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel is generally agreed upon by the ancient writers, who have made any mention of the matter, viz. that he *wrote it at Jerusalem for the sake of the convert Jews, who desired him to write it, when he was about to travel to the Gentile countries to preach the Gospel.* So Origen[u]; "The first Gospel was written by "Matthew, first a publican, then an apostle of Jesus Christ, "and published among the converted Jews in Hebrew." Eusebius is more particular[x]; he tells us, "That the apostles "were not much inclined to write books.—That Paul wrote "only a few short Epistles.—That of all our Lord's disciples "Matthew and John only have left us any written memoirs, "and it is said, they were compelled by some sort of necessity

[p] Hist. Lit. vol. 1. p. 114. et 121.

[q] Doroth. de Vit. ac Mort. Prophet. et Apostol. Biblioth. Patr. vol. 7. ad voc. Matth.

[r] Pædagog. l. 2. c. 1. p. 148. Σπερμάτων, καὶ ἀκροδρύων, καὶ λαχάνων, ἄνευ κρεῶν μετελάμβανεν.

[s] Hor. Hebr. in Matth. ix. 9.

[t] According to Abdias Babylonicus, lib. 7. cap. 14. he was run through the back in the temple at Nadabbar in Ethiopia, by a soldier, by the order of the king Hyrtacus, whose marriage with Iphigenia, his brother's daughter, St. Matthew opposed, she being a nun.

[u] Exposit. in Matth. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 6. c. 25.

[x] Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 24.

" to write what they did; for Matthew having first preached to " the Hebrews, when he determined to travel into other coun- " tries, published his Gospel in the language of his country, " and left it with them to supply the want of his own presence " among them." To the same purpose Jerome[y]; " Matthew, " surnamed Levi, was the first who published a Gospel, and " that in Judæa, in the Hebrew language, principally for the " sake of those Jews who were converted, and did not regard " the truth of the Gospel, (but observed the law also,) though " the law, as being but a shadow, was abolished."

CHAP. II.

St. Matthew's Gospel of canonical authority. It is in all the ancient catalogues of sacred books. It is cited by the primitive fathers; viz. seven times in the Epistle of Barnabas, twice in the first Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, eight times in the Fragment of the second, eight times in the Shepherd of Hermas, six times in Polycarp's small Epistle to the Philippians, twice in a Fragment of his Responsiones, and seven times in the lesser Epistles of Ignatius.

HAVING given some account of the author of this Gospel, I proceed now to establish its authority, which I hope will be effectually done by the following arguments.

ARG. I. St. Matthew's Gospel is of canonical authority, because *it is in all the catalogues of canonical books which we have among the writings of the primitive Christians.* Prop. IV. These catalogues, viz. that of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyrill, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Ruffin, Austin, the third council of Carthage, and the author of the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite, I have collected them, Vol. I. Part I. Ch. VIII. and there referred to the several places where these catalogues at large are to be found, and in every one of them the Gospel of St. Matthew is enumerated.

Arg. II. The Gospel of St. Matthew is canonical, because

[y] Præf. in Comm. in Matth.

it is cited as scripture in the writings of the primitive Christian fathers. Prop. V.

I have observed, Part I. Ch. V. p. 37. and Ch. IX. p. 58. that Mr. Dodwell [z], and from him Mr. Toland [a] have endeavoured in a good measure to rob us of this argument, by asserting, "That the first writers of Christianity had no certain "canon, or collection of sacred scriptures of the New Testa- "ment, which they cited; the apocryphal writings being "bound in the same volume with the apostles' writings; that "in Hermas there is not one place of the New Testament "quoted, nor in either of the other is any evangelist named: "and if they do perhaps produce any places, which are like "some in our Gospels, yet you will find them so changed, and "so much interpolated, that it is impossible to know whether "they took them out of ours, or some other apocryphal Gos- "pels. But it is certain they sometimes used the apocryphal "books, and cited what is not in our Gospels,—if they cite "sometimes any passages, which agree with our canonical "Gospels, that was not done by any design, so as to evidence "that they intended to confirm disputable points out of ca- "nonical books; so that perhaps those very passages, which "seem to be taken out of our Gospels, were taken out of "others," &c.

Dr. Grabe [b] and Dr. Mill [c] have adopted the same sentiments into their scheme, the design of which, with a confutation of it, the reader may see above in the first dissertation prefixed to this part. The reason of my mentioning it here, is, because I am now entering upon the particular proof of their citing the books of our present canon; and as I have Vol. I. Part II.

[z] Sic autem vera apostolorum scripta cum apocryphis in iisdem voluminibus compingi solebant, ut nulla prorsus nota aut censura ecclesiæ publica constaret, quæ quibus essent anteferenda. Habemus hodieque horum temporum scriptores ecclesiasticos luculentissimos, Clementem Romanum, Barnabam, Hermam, Ignatium, Polycarpum —At Novi Testamenti in Herma ne quidem unum locum inveneris; apud reliquos ne unum quidem evangelistam nomine suo compellatum. Et si quos locos forte proferant, quibus similia in nostris leguntur evangeliis, ita tamen illos mutatos ut plurimum interpolatosque reperies, ut sciri nequeat, an e nostris illos, an ex aliis produxerint apocryphis evangeliis, &c. *Dissert. in Iren.* I. §. 39, &c.

[a] Amyntor, p. 69, &c.

[b] Spicileg. Patr. tom. I. p. 322.

[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 138, &c.

shewn, that the primitive Christians have not cited any apocryphal books, so I shall endeavour now to shew, that they have cited and referred to those which we now receive, and for that purpose shall transcribe and set down the very words, with the manner of their being cited or introduced, together with the words of our canonical books, which I take to be referred to, in a parallel column.

N. B. I have set down the citations at length only of those which are called the apostolic fathers, because the citations in the other fathers are so plain and so numerous, that there can be about them no dispute; and though I do not believe the writings under the names of Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, Polycarp, Hermas, and Ignatius, are all genuine, and of that age to which they pretend; yet as they are undoubtedly very ancient, and referred to by some of the earliest fathers, I thought it proper to give them the first place in my collection.

A Catalogue of the several places of St. Matthew's Gospel, which are cited or referred to in the writings of the apostolic fathers.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*	BARNABAS'S *Epistle.*
I. Ch. xxiv. 22. Κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι: i. e. *Those days shall be shortened.*	I. Ch. iv. Dominus intercidet tempora et dies; i. e. *The Lord will shorten those times and days.* That which proves this a reference to St. Matthew is, that the author adds it upon a citation out of Dan. ix. which is the very same on account of which our Lord is related by St. Matthew to have said it [d].
II. Ch. xx. 16. and xxii. 14. Πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί: i. e. *For many are called, but few are chosen.*	II. Ch. iv. Sicut scriptum est, *Multi vocati, pauci electi;* i. e. as it is written, *Many are called, but few are chosen.*

N. B. *The reason why these two citations are put in Latin, is,*

[d] Respiciunt hæc verba Domini Matt. xxiv. 2. Fell in loc.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

III. Ch. ix. 13. Οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν· *For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*

IV. Ch. xxvi. 31. Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης: *I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.*

BARNABAS'S *Epistle.*

because we have not the Greek of Barnabas till the middle of the fifth chapter.

III. Ch. v. Ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθε καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν: i. e. *that he might shew, that he came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance*[e].

IV. Ch. v. Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, τότε σκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης: i. e. *I will smite the shepherd, then the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.*

If it be objected here, that this author might take this, as our Saviour did, out of Zechariah xiii. 7. and not out of St. Matthew's Gospel, I answer, that this cannot be supposed, because in the Hebrew the verb הךְ is in the second person, and the imperative mood, and accordingly the LXX. and all the Greek Versions have rendered it in the imperative mood, *Smite the shepherd;* whereas Barnabas places that verb in the first person of the future tense, πατάξω, *I will smite,* which could only proceed from his citing and following St. Matthew, where we read πατάξω, *I will smite.* Hugo Menardus (*in loc. Barnab.*) has made a like observation upon the word δια-

[e] The preceding context in that place of Barnabas plainly refers also to this in St. Matthew; for whereas it is there said, that when Christ chose his apostles, he took those who were exceeding great sinners, it must needs be that he refers to the call of Matthew, and Christ's being censured for going to his house, and supping with him and other sinners. See Orig. contr. Cels. lib. 1. p. 49. and the Appendix to the first volume, p. 359.—See also Toland's Amyntor, p. 44. and Richardson's Answer, p. 105, 106.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

V. Ch. xxvii. 54. Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος: i. e. *Truly this was the Son of God.*

VI. Ch. xxii. 43, 44, 45. Christ proves himself to be the Lord from Psalm cx. 1. *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou,* &c. Εἰ οὖν Δαβὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν Κύριον, &c. *If then David calls him Lord,* &c.

VII. Ch. v. 42. Τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου: i. e. *Give to him that asketh thee.*

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

I. Ch. vi. 14. *If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you.*

BARNABAS'S *Epistle.*

σκορπισθήσεται, viz. of this author's following Matthew, which is yet more evident, if our Cambridge edition of the LXX. be right, which has instead of that verb in the future tense, the verb ἐκσπάσατε in the imperative mood.

V. Ch. vii. Ἀληθῶς οὗτος ἦν, ὁ τότε λέγων ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν Θεοῦ εἶναι: i. e. *Truly this was he, who then said, he was the Son of God.*

The words in St. Matthew are a confession of Christ extorted from the centurion at Christ's crucifixion, and the words in Barnabas are also a confession extorted from the Jews; so that there can be no doubt but he had read and referred to St. Matthew here.

VI. Ch. xii. This author cites the same words of the Psalmist, and concludes, Ἴδε πῶς λέγει Δαβὶδ αὐτὸν Κύριον, &c. *See how David calls him Lord,* &c. Which is an argument so exactly agreeing with our Saviour's both in sense and words, that one cannot suppose but that this author took it from St. Matthew, or at least from St. Mark [xii. 36.] or St. Luke [xx. 42.]

VII. Ch. xix. Παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου: i. e. *Give to every one that asketh thee.*

The first Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

I. Ch. xiii. Forgive, that ye may be forgiven; as ye judge, so ye shall be judged; with what

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

Ch. vii. 1. *Judge not, lest ye be judged:* ver. 2. *With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.*

II. Ch. xviii. 6, 7. Ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμὲ, συμφέρει αὐτῷ ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. Οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων, &c. i. e. *But whoso shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Woe unto the world because of offences,* &c.

The first Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

Clemens advises the Corinthians here, to remember these and other sayings of the Lord Jesus.

II. Ch. xlvi. Μνήσθητε τῶν λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. Εἶπε γάρ· Οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, ἢ ἕνα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι· κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτῷ περιτεθῆναι μύλον, καὶ καταποντισθῆναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν μου σκανδαλίσαι: i. e. Remember the words of the Lord Jesus; for he said, *Woe to that man; it had been better for him if he had not been born, than that he should offend one of my elect. It were better for him that a millstone were put upon him, (his neck,) and that he were drowned in the sea, than to have offended one of these little ones.*

Cotelerius observes upon this place of Clemens, that he has here, according to the common practice of the ancients, joined several texts of scripture together; and that he made use in this collection of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; and this is not improbable; however it is certain, that he makes use of another place of St. Matthew, (viz. xxvi. 24.) the words, *It had been better for him if he had not been born,* being there spoke of

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*

The first Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

Judas Iscariot, and in neither of the three evangelists speaking of offences.

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*

The second Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

I. Ch. xviii. 11. Christ came σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός: i. e. *to save that (or those) which were lost.*

I. Ch. i. Christ has done us this advantage, ἀπολλυμένους ἡμᾶς ἔσωσεν: i. e. *He has saved us who were lost.*

II. Ch. ix. 13. Οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν: i. e. *For I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.*

II. Ch. ii. Καὶ ἑτέρα δὲ γραφὴ λέγει· Ὅτι οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλούς: i. e. And another scripture saith, *I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.*

III. Ch. x. 32. Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς: i. e. *Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven.*

III. Ch. iii. Λέγει δὲ καὶ αὐτός· Τὸν ὁμολογήσαντά με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Πατρός μου: i. e. For he himself saith, *Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father.*

IV. Ch. vii. 21. Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς: i. e. *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father who is in heaven.*

IV. Ch. iv. Λέγει γάρ, Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, Κύριε, σωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην: i. e. For [the Lord] saith, *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall be saved, but he that worketh righteousness.*

V. Ch. vii. 23. Οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν: i. e. *I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity.*

V. Ch. iv. Ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἔστε, ἐργάται ἀνομίας: i. e. *Depart from me, I know ye not whence ye are, ye workers of iniquity.*

This seems to be a citation,

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*

VI. Ch. x. 16, 26, 28. Ἰδοὺ, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων·—26. Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς·—28. Καὶ μὴ φοβήθητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβήθητε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ: i. e. *Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves*—26. *Fear them not therefore;*— 28. *And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.*

VII. Ch. xvi. 26. Τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; i. e. *For what is a man profited, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?*

VIII. Ch. xii. 50. Ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς, καὶ ἀδελφὴ, καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν: i. e. *For*

The second Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

like that above out of the first Epistle, N°. 2. if it was not taken out of Luke, (see the Appendix to Vol. I. p. 359, 361.) the words πόθεν ἔστε being in Luke xiii. 27. and not in Matthew.

VI. Ch. v. Ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.—Μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτείνοντας ὑμᾶς, καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν· ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γεένναν πυρός: i. e. *Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves:.—Let not the lambs fear the wolves after death, and do not ye fear those who [can] kill you, and [afterwards] can do you no harm; but fear him who has power, after your death, to cast both soul and body into hell fire.*

In the midst of this passage there is a question of Peter to Christ, viz. What if the wolves should tear in pieces the lambs? but concerning this, see the Appendix to Vol. I. p. 360, 361.

VII. Ch. vi. Τί γὰρ τὸ ὄφελος, ἐάν τις τὸν ὅλον κόσμον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιώσῃ; i. e. *For what will it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?*

VIII. Ch. ix. Καὶ γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἱ ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρός μου: i. e. For the Lord hath said,

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother and sister and mother.

The second Epistle of CLEMENS ROMANUS *to the Corinthians.*

They are my brethren, who do the will of my Father.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

I. Ch. v. 28. *But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*

The Shepherd of HERMAS.

I. Lib. I. Vis. i. §. 1. An non videtur tibi, viro justo rem iniquam esse, si ascenderit in corde mala concupiscentia? i. e. Does it not seem to you to be a sin, *for a good man to have lustful inclinations in his heart?*

N. B. The Greek of Hermas not being extant, but only a Latin version, I judged there could be no necessity of inserting St. Matthew's Greek.

He who considers that this is said by a woman, who expressly in the words before charges Hermas with sin against God and her, not for fornication, (for this he denies,) but for having desired or having in his heart lusted after her, will easily see there is a reference to Christ's words.

II. Ch. x. 32, 33. *Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven: but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.*

II. Lib. i. Vis. ii. §. 2. Juravit enim Dominus per Filium suum: qui denegaverit Filium et se, despondens vitam illius, et ipse denegaturus est illum in adventientibus diebus. Ii autem qui nunquam denegaverint, ob nimiam misericordiam propitius factus est illis; i. e. The Lord hath sworn by his Son, *that whosoever shall deny his Son and him, being afraid of his life, he will also deny him in the world to come; but those who shall never deny him, he will then of his great mercy receive them into his favour.*

III. Ch. xiii. 21, 22. *Yet hath*

III. Lib. i. Vis. iii. §. 6. Hi

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

he not root in himself, but dureth for a while; for when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word, by and by he is offended; he also that received the word among the thorns, is he that heareth the word, and the care of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, &c.

IV. Ch. xxvi. 24. *Woe unto that man—it had been good for that man if he had not been born.*

V. Ch. v. 28. *I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.*

VI. Ch. xix. 9. *Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is*

The Shepherd of HERMAS.

sunt habentes quidem fidem, habentes autem et divitias hujus seculi; cum ergo venerit tribulatio, propter divitias suas et negotiationes abnegant Dominum; i. e. *They are persons professing Christianity, (i. e. who own the word,) but having also the riches of this world, when tribulation ariseth, (on account of the word,) by reason of their riches and worldly cares they deny the Lord, or* (which is the same) *are offended.*

IV. Lib. i. Vis. iv. §. 2. Væ iis—melius erat illis non nasci; i. e. *Woe unto them—for it had been better for these men they had not been born.*

The phrase is evidently borrowed from St. Matthew.

V. Lib. ii. Mandat. iv. §. 1. Non ascendat tibi cogitatio cordis de alieno matrimonio, aut de fornicatione; hæc enim parit peccatum magnum.—Si enim hæc cogitatio in cor tuum ascenderit tam mala, magnum peccatum facis; i. e. *Let not any purpose be entertained in thy mind of committing adultery, or fornication, for even this purpose produceth a great sin.—And if such evil purpose be in thy mind, thou committest great sin.* See above out of this book of Hermas, N°. 1.

VI. Lib. ii. Mandat. iv. §. 1. Si permanserit in vitio suo mulier—dimittat illam vir, et vir per se maneat. Quod si dimiserit mulierem suam, et aliam duxerit,

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*	*The Shepherd of* HERMAS.
put away, doth commit adultery. See Matt. v. 23.	et ipse mœchatur—propter hoc præceptum est vobis, ut cœlibes maneatis, tum vir, tum mulier; potest enim in hujusmodi pœnitentia esse; i. e. *If a wife shall persist in adulterous practices, a husband may put her away, and live alone; but if he shall marry another woman, he committeth adultery—*
	Mr. Nye has in part observed this place of Hermas, and says, no doubt it was taken from St. Luke xvi. 18. See his Defence of the Canon against Amyntor, p. 48.
VII. Ch. xxi. 22. *All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing,* (i. e. as in ver. 21. not doubting,) *ye shall receive.*	VII. Lib. ii. Mandat. ix. Tolle a te dubitationem, et nihil omnino dubites—pete sine dubitatione—petitionem animæ tuæ adimplebit—ex omnibus petitionibus tuis nihil deerit tibi, si sine dubitatione petieris a Domino; i. e. *Remove from thee all doubting, and doubt not at all—ask without doubting,* (*or in faith,*) *and* [*God*] *will grant thy requests—all things whatsoever thou shalt ask shall be given thee, if thou ask them of the Lord without doubting* (*or in faith*).
VIII. Ch. xxi. 33. *The parable of the vineyard.*	VIII. Lib. iii. Simil. v. §. 2. He seems to have borrowed the similitude from the parable of our Saviour referred to in the opposite column.
IX. Ch. xvi. 18. *And upon this rock I will build my church.*	IX. Lib. iii. Simil. ix. The church is compared to a tower built upon a rock. See §. 2, 3. 12, 13, 14.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*

I. See above under Clemens Romanus, Epist. I. N°. 2.

II. Ch. v. 3, 10. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. 10. Μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν: i. e. *Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* ver. 10. *Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

III. Ch. vi. 12. Καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν: i. e. *And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;* and ver. 14. *For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you.*

IV. Ch. vi. 13. Καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν: *And lead us not into temptation.*

V. Ch. xxvi. 41. Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής; i. e. *The spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak.*

VI. Ch. v. 44. Προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ

The Epistle of POLYCARP *to the Philippians.*

I. Cap. ii. The words in Polycarp are near the same with those referred to in the parallel column. I only observe, that he introduces them, Μνημονεύσαντες δὲ ὧν εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος διδάσκων: i. e. *Remember the things which the Lord said in his teaching (or sermon on the mount).*

II. Cap. ii. Immediately after the preceding words he cites further; Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ, καὶ οἱ διωκόμενοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ: i. e. *Blessed are the poor [in spirit], and they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of God.*

III. Cap. vi. Εἰ οὖν δεόμεθα τοῦ Κυρίου, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀφῇ, ὀφείλομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιέναι: i. e. *If therefore we pray to the Lord that he would forgive us, we ought likewise to forgive others.*

IV. Cap. vii. Δεήσεσιν αἰτούμενοι τὸν παντεπόπτην Θεὸν, μὴ εἰσενεγκεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν: Earnestly praying to the all-seeing God, *not to lead us into temptation.*

V. Cap. vii. Καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος· Τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής: i. e. As the Lord hath said, *The spirit truly is willing, but the flesh is weak.*

VI. Ch. xii. Orate—pro per-

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*	*The Epistle of* POLYCARP *to the Philippians.*
τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, καὶ διωκόντων ὑμᾶς: i. e. *Pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.*	sequentibus et odientibus vos; i. e. *Pray for those who persecute you and hate you.*

After these it will not be improper to add, that in the Fragments of the Responsiones of Polycarp, published by Feuardentius in Irenæus, lib. 3. c. 3. I find two places of St. Matthew's Gospel expounded or paraphrased; viz.

1. Matthæus Dominum dixisse testatur, quod Moyses scribit Adam loquutum fuisse hoc modo; Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro ex carne mea; propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, &c.	1. Matthew testifies that our Lord said, *It was written by Moses, that Adam said thus; This now is bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh; for this cause shall a man leave father and mother,* &c. See Matt. xix. 5. and Gen. ii. 23, 24.
2. Calicem meum bibetis, &c. Per hujusmodi potum significat passionem, &c.	2. Matt. xx. 23. *Ye shall drink indeed of my cup,* &c. by which cup he meant the martyrdom of those two apostles, John and James.

The Lesser, or those which are supposed the genuine Epistles of IGNATIUS, *particularly;*

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*	1. *The Epistle of* IGNATIUS *to the Ephesians.*
I. Ch. xviii. 19. *If two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven; for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.*	I. Ch. v. Εἰ γὰρ ἑνὸς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχὴ τοσαύτην ἰσχὺν ἔχει, &c. *For if the prayers of one or two be of such force,* &c. The larger Epistle adds, Ὥστε τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑστάναι, *as that Christ will be in the midst of them.*
II. Ch. xii. 33. Ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται: i. e. *For the tree is known by its fruit.*	II. Ch. xiv. Φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ: i. e. *The tree is known by its fruit.*

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*	
III. Ch. xxiii. 8, 10. Εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ καθηγητής: i. e. *For one is your master.*	1. *The Epistle of* IGNATIUS *to the Ephesians.* III. Ch. xv. Εἷς οὖν διδάσκαλος: i. e. *One is* [*your*] *master.*
IV. Ch. ii. 2. Εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα: i. e. *We have seen his star.*	IV. Ch. xix. Ἀστὴρ ἐν οὐρανῷ ἔλαμψεν: i. e. *His star shone in heaven.*
	2. *The Epistle to the* MAGNESIANS.
Ch. xxvii. 52, 53. *And the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection,* &c.	Ch. ix. The prophets expected Christ, and when he came, ἤγειρεν αὐτοὺς ἐκ νεκρῶν, *he raised them from the dead.*
	3. *The Epistle to the* SMYRNEANS.
I. Ch. iii. 15. Πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην: i. e. *It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* Christ assigns this as a reason for his being baptized by John.	I. Ch. i. Christ was baptized by John, Ἵνα πληρωθῇ πᾶσα δικαιοσύνη ὑπ' αὐτοῦ: i. e. *That all righteousness might be fulfilled by him.*
II. Ch. xix. 12. Ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω: i. e. *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.*	II. Ch. vi. Ὁ χωρῶν χωρείτω: i. e. *He that can receive it, let him receive it.*
	4. *The Epistle to* POLYCARP.
Ch. x. 16. Γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί: i. e. *Be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.*	Ch. ii. Φρόνιμος γίνου ὡς ὁ ὄφις, καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡσεὶ περιστερά: i. e. *Be thou wise as a serpent, and harmless as a dove.*

Thus I have collected and produced at large several of those passages of St. Matthew's Gospel, which the apostolic fathers appear evidently to have cited or referred to; so that it will be henceforth manifest, by a bare cast of the eye upon the preceding tables, how much Mr. Dodwell and his followers have been mistaken in their famous notion, that none of our Gospels were cited by those fathers.

CHAP. III.

St. Matthew's Gospel further proved canonical by the citations out of it made by the fathers next the apostolic age. Thirty-five places in Justin Martyr's works produced, where it is cited. It is cited four times in the small treatise of Athenagoras; five times by Theophilus Antiochenus; above two hundred and fifty times by Irenæus, in nine of which places he is named; seventy-three times in the works of Clemens Alexandrinus; and twenty-seven times in his small tract entitled, Quis Dives Salvetur? *This Gospel proved canonical, because it was read in the Christian churches, and is in the Syriac version.*

IT appearing thus, how particularly the apostolic fathers have cited St. Matthew, I proceed now to shew, how the fathers immediately succeeding the apostolic age have cited St. Matthew; not as above to produce all the several places at large, which would be almost to transcribe the Gospels, but only to lay down the several chapters and verses of the Gospel, with the particular places of those fathers' works where they are cited; nor shall I think it needful to do this with all the writers of the first four centuries, but such only as were the most early, and are the most considerable. It will be enough to shew instances in such as Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, &c. who lived in the second century, and to observe concerning the fathers of the next centuries, such as Origen, Cyprian, Cyril, Austin, and others of and about their time, that they do in innumerable places cite this as well as our other Gospels; for the proof of which I would refer the reader, who will take no further pains in the matter, to the indexes of the texts of scripture, which are made and put at the end of their works by their editors. I proceed then to those early fathers above named, viz. Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus Antiochenus, Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrinus, whose works I have with this view carefully examined, and find them very often to have cited or referred to this Gospel of St. Matthew.

I. *As to* JUSTIN MARTYR.

A Catalogue of several places which are cited out of St. Matthew's Gospel in the works of Justin Martyr.

St. MATTHEW'S *Gospel.*	JUSTIN MARTYR'S *Works.*
1 Ch. i. 21.	1 Apolog. 2. pro Christo, p. 75.
2 Ch. ii. 11.	2 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 315. et p. 334. *This he says he cited* ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ, from the Commentaries of Christ's apostles.
3 Ch. iii. 1, 2, 3, 11.	3 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 316.
4 —— 11, 12.	4 Ibid. p. 268.
5 Ch. iv. 1—8, 9, 10, 11.	5 Ibid. p. 354. and p. 331. *This he says was written in the* ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων: i. e. in the Commentaries of the apostles.
6 Ch. v. 20.	6 Ibid. p. 333. *This he says he learnt from the same books.*
7 Ch. v. 16, 22, 28, 29, 32, 36, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47; and Ch. vi. 2, 19, 20, 21, 26, 32, 33, 35, 45. viz. *a considerable part of our Lord's sermon on the mount in St. Matthew's words.*	7 Apolog. 2. pro Christian. p. 61, 62, 63.
8 Ch. v. 44.	8 Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 324.
9 Ch. vii. 15.	9 Ibid. p. 253.
10 —— 19, 21, &c.	10 Apolog. 2. pro Christ. p. 64. et Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 301.
11 Ch. viii. 11.	11 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 301, 349, 370.
12 Ch. ix. 13.	12 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 62.
13 Ch. x. 28.	13 Ibid. p. 66.
14 Ch. xi. 12—15.	14 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 271.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	Justin Martyr's *Works.*
15 Ch. xi. 27.	15 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 95. et in Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 326.
16 Ch. xii. 39, 40.	16 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 334.
17 Ch. xiii. 3, 4, &c.	17 Ibid. p. 354.
18 Ch. xvi. 21.	18 Ibid. p. 302 et 327.
19 ——— 26, 27.	19 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 62.
20 Ch. xvii. 10, 11, 12.	20 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 269.
21 Ch. xix. 12.	21 Apolog. 2. pro Christian. p. 62.
22 ——— 16, 17.	22 Ibid. p. 63. et Dial. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 328.
23 ——— 26.	23 Ibid. p. 66.
24 Ch. xxi. 1, 2.	24 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 272.
25 ——— 13.	25 Ibid. p. 235.
26 Ch. xxii. 16, 17—21.	26 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 64.
27 ——— 30.	27 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 308.
28 ——— 32.	28 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 96.
29 ——— 36, &c.	29 Ibid. p. 63.
30 Ch. xxiii. 23, 27.	30 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 235, et 339.
31 Ch. xxiv. 24.	31 Ibid. p. 253.
32 Ch. xxvi. 26, &c.	32 Apol. 2. pro Christ. p. 98. *This he says is delivered by the apostles,* ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια: i. e. in the commentaries or books made by them, which are called Gospels.
33 ——— 39.	33 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 326, et 331.
34 Ch. xxvii. 42, 43.	34 Ibid. p. 328.
35 ——— 46.	35 Ibid. p. 326.

II. Athenagoras.

He was a writer of the second century, either coeval with, or not long after Justin Martyr; he wrote an excellent Apology for Christianity, which is inscribed to M. Aurelius Antoninus, and L. Aurelius Commodus, in which, though a short work, I have observed the following references to St. Matthew's Gospel.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	Athenagoræ Legat. pro Christian.
1 Ch. v. 44, 45.	1 Page 11.
2 —— 46, 47.	2 —— 12.
3 —— 28.	3 —— 36.
4 Ch. xix. 9.	4 —— 37.

III. Theophilus Antiochenus.

He lived under the same emperors, and was contemporary with Athenagoras; he wrote three small treatises, inscribed to Autolycus, against the enemies of Christianity. He made use also of St. Matthew's Gospel, as appears from the following places.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	Theophilus Antiochenus.
1 Ch. xix. 26.	1 Lib. 1. p. 92.
2 Ch. v. 28.	2 Lib. 3. p. 126. *He cites under the name of* Εὐαγγελικὸς φωνή.
3 Ch. xix. 9.	3 Ibid.
4 Ch. v. 44—47.	4 Ibid.
5 Ch. vi. 3.	5 Ibid.

IV. Irenæus.

I proposed here, as in the former instance, to have produced all the several places in Irenæus, where St. Matthew's Gospel is cited; but since that purpose, I find myself prevented herein by the care and industry of Feuardentius: at the end of his edition of Irenæus, there is an index already made with great exactness, of most of the citations which that father has made of this Gospel; I have been at the pains carefully to examine every one of them, and do not find above ten or twelve false references in the whole. It will be enough therefore to refer the reader to the index of Feuardentius, only adding two observations which I have made, viz.

(1.) That Irenæus has at least two hundred and fifty times cited or taken passages out of this Gospel.

(2.) That he does several times cite St. Matthew by name; viz. in the following places:

1. Lib. 3. adv. Hæres. c. 11. p. 259. citing those words, Matt. i. 1.

2 Lib. 3. c. 18. p. 277. citing ch. i. 1, 18—21.

3 Lib. 3. c. 26. in init. collat. cum 25. in fin. citing ch. i. 18.

4 Lib. 3. c. 10. citing ch. ii. 2, &c.

5 Lib. 3. c. 9. citing ch. ii. 13.

6 Ibid. citing ch. iii. 3.

7 Ibid. citing ch. iii. 7.

8 Ibid. citing ch. iii. 9.

9 Lib. 3. c. 18. citing ch. iii. 16.

V. Clemens Alexandrinus.

There is indeed a large collection of the texts of this Gospel cited by Clemens, prefixed to his works; but upon inquiry, I find this collection in many respects so inaccurate, so false, and defective, that as I could not depend upon it myself, so neither can I refer the reader to it. I have therefore made the following collection, which, though perhaps it does not contain all the places of St. Matthew's Gospel cited by Clemens, yet, I dare say, contains the far greatest part, without any one reference which is not fairly and justly made.

A Catalogue of the places of St. Matthew's Gospel, cited or referred to by Clemens Alexandrinus.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
1 Ch. iii. 7.	1 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 123.
2 —— 9.	2 Admonit. ad Gent. p. 3.
3 —— 12.	3 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 125.
4 Ch. v. 5.	4 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 488.
5 —— 8.	5 ——— lib. 5. p. 548.
6 —— 10.	6 ——— lib. 4. p. 484.
7 —— 13.	7 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 11. p. 257. et Stromat. lib. 1. p. 290.
8 —— 15.	8 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 275.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
9 Ch. v. 20.	9 Stromat. lib. 6. p. 696.
10 —— 25.	10 —— lib. 4. p. 512.
11 —— 27, 28.	11 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 6. p. 169. et Admonit. ad Gent. p. 68.
12 —— 29.	12 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 11. p. 251.
13 —— 36.	13 —— c. 3. p. 223.
14 —— 37.	14 Stromat. lib. 5. p. 596.
15 —— 39, 40.	15 Admonit. ad Gent. p. 68. et Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 12. p. 262.
16 —— 44, 45.	16 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 511, 512. et Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 118, 119.
17 —— 48.	17 —— lib. 4. p. 529.
18 Ch. vi. 1, 2, &c.	18 Ibid.
19 —— 9.	19 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 119.
20 —— 24.	20 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 436. et lib. 6. p. 486.
21 —— 25, 26, &c.	21 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 1. p. 148. et lib. ejusd. c. 10. p. 197, 198. et Stromat. lib. 4. p. 487.
22 —— 34.	22 —— lib. 1. c. 12. p. 134. et ejusd. lib. c. 5. p. 88.
23 Ch. vii. 6.	23 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 297.
24 —— 7.	24 —— p. 295. et lib. 2. p. 410. lib. 3. p. 450. lib. 5. p. 553.
25 —— 12.	25 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 12. p. 260. confer Stromat. lib. 2. p. 421.
26 —— 13.	26 Admonit. ad Gent. p. 63. et Stromat. lib. 4. p. 476.
27 —— 15.	27 Admonit. ad Gent. p. 3.
28 —— 18.	28 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 5. p. 166.
29 Ch. viii. 12.	29 —— lib. 1. c. 10. p. 129.
30 —— 20.	30 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 280.
31 —— 22.	31 —— lib. 3. p. 436.
32 Ch. x. 5.	32 —— lib. 3. p. 472.

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.
33 Ch. x. 23.	33 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 504.
34 —— 26.	34 ——— lib. 1. p. 275.
35 —— 27.	35 ——— p. 297.
36 —— 32, 33.	36 ——— lib. 4. p. 502, 503.
37 —— 39.	37 ——— lib. 2. p. 407. et lib. 4. p. 484.
38 —— 41.	38 ——— lib. 4. p. 488.
39 Ch. xi. 3, 4, &c.	39 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 10. p. 129.
40 —— 12.	40 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 476. et lib. 5. p. 553.
41 —— 17.	41 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 5. p. 85.
42 —— 18.	42 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 448.
43 —— 19.	43 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 2. p. 158.
44 —— 25.	44 ——— lib. 1. c. 6. p. 96.
45 —— 27.	45 ——— p. 89. et c. 8. p. 119.
46 —— 28, 29, 30.	46 Admonit. ad Gent. p. 75. et Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 10. p. 129. et Stromat. lib. 5. p. 560.
47 Ch. xii. 36, 37.	47 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 6. p. 169.
48 Ch. xiii. 11.	48 Stromat. lib. 5. p. 586.
49 ——— 13.	49 ——— lib. 1. p. 270.
50 Ch. xv. 9.	50 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 121.
51 ——— 11.	51 ——— lib. 2. c. 6. p. 168.
52 ——— 22.	52 Stromat. lib. 6. p. 680.
53 Ch. xvii. 5.	53 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 11. p. 133.
54 Ch. xviii. 3.	54 ——— c. 5. p. 85.
55 ——— 21, 22.	55 ——— lib. 3. c. 12. p. 261.
56 Ch. xix. 6, 8.	56 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 446.
57 ——— 10, 11, 12.	57 ——— p. 447.
58 ——— 13.	58 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 5. p. 85.
59 ——— 21.	59 ——— lib. 2. c. 3. p. 160. et Stromat. lib. 4. p. 485.
60 Ch. xx. 16.	60 Stromat. lib. 5. p. 554.
61 ——— 28.	61 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 126.
62 Ch. xxii. 30.	62 ——— c. 4. p. 84.
63 ——— 37.	63 ——— lib. 3. c. 12. p. 260.
64 ——— 37—40.	64 Stromat. lib. 2. p. 391.
65 Ch. xxiii. 6.	65 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 12. p. 262.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
66 Ch. xxiii. 9.	66 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 463.
67 ——— 27.	67 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 9. p. 241.
68 ——— 37.	68 ——— lib. 1. c. 5. p. 86. et c. 9. p. 121. et 123.
69 Ch. xxiv. 13.	69 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 503.
70 Ch. xxv. 34, &c.	70 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 12. p. 262. et Stromat. lib. 2. p. 391, 392.
71 ——— 40.	71 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 4. p. 231.
72 Ch. xxvi. 23.	72 ——— lib. 2. c. 8. p. 176.
73 ——— 26—28.	73 ——— c. 2. p. 158.

Besides the works of Clemens Alexandrinus, which are usually found together, there is also a small tract extant, entitled, Τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλοῦσιος; i. e. *What rich man can be saved?* published last by bishop Fell at Oxford, 1683; it seems to have full evidence of its genuineness, not only that Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. l. 3. c. 23. cites a large piece of it as the work of Clemens under this same title, but that Photius, Cod. 111. says, "The Stromata of Clemens Alexandrinus were in a very an- "cient copy of that father's works reckoned to be *eight;* "*whereas now there are but seven:* the first seven," says he, "had the same title, but the eighth differed, being entitled in "some copies, *What rich man can be saved?*"—The treatise is very small, not making above sixty small pages in the Oxford duodecimo edition, but contains such numerous citations of this and other proofs of the New Testament, that I thought it proper to collect them.

St. Matthew's *Gospel.*	*The Treatise of* Clemens Alexandrinus, *entitled,* Quis Dives Salvetur?
1 Ch. v. 3.	1 Cap. xvi. p. 42. et c. xvii. p. 46. In this place St. Matthew is cited by name.
2 ——— 6.	2 Ibid.
3 ——— 13, 14.	3 Cap. xxxvi. p. 97.
4 ——— 25.	4 ——— xl. p. 106.
5 ——— 29.	5 ——— xxiv. p. 65.

St. MATTHEW's *Gospel.*	*The Treatise of* CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, *entitled,* Quis Dives Salvetur?
6 Ch. v. 39.	6 Cap. xviii. p. 49.
7 Ch. vi. 14.	7 —— xl. p. 105.
8 —— 19.	8 —— xiii. p. 34.
9 —— 21.	9 —— xvii. p. 45.
10 Ch. vii. 1, &c.	10 —— xxxiii. p. 90.
11 —— 21.	11 —— xxix. p. 81.
12 Ch. ix. 13.	12 —— xxxix. p. 102.
13 Ch. x. 22.	13 —— xxxii. p. 89.
14 —— 40.	14 —— xxxi. p. 82.
15 —— 41.	15 —— p. 85.
16 Ch. xi. 12.	16 —— xxi. p. 57.
17 —— 27.	17 —— viii. p. 21.
18 Ch. xii. 35.	18 —— xvii. p. 45.
19 Ch. xiii. 17.	19 —— xxix. p. 81.
20 Ch. xvii. 27.	20 —— xxi. p. 58.
21 Ch. xviii. 10.	21 —— xxxi. p. 82.
22 Ch. xix. 21.	22 —— x. p. 25.
23 —— 24.	23 —— ii. p. 6.
24 —— 27, 28.	24 —— xxii. p. 58.
25 Ch. xxii. 36, 37, &c.	25 —— xxvi. p. 74, &c.
26 Ch. xxiii. 12.	26 —— i. p. 5. Here this Gospel is called Θεῖος λόγος, i. e. the word of God.
27 Ch. xxv. 36, &c.	27 —— xiii. p. 34.

Arg. III. The Gospel of St. Matthew is canonical, *because it was read as scripture in the assemblies or churches of the primitive Christians*, by Prop. VI. I have above proved (Vol. I. Part I. Ch. X.) from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, &c. that it was the constant custom of the primitive churches to read the sacred scriptures as part of their most solemn divine service; I am now to prove that St. Matthew's Gospel was always among these books; and that will be evident,

1. From Cyril of Jerusalem; who, enumerating the books which ought to be read in the churches, and which were read in the churches, says, "Among the New Testament books "there were only four Gospels, and that all others were spu-

" rious and hurtful [f]." After reciting the other books of the New Testament, he adds a little below, " That all others were " to be rejected, and as not being read in the church, were not " to be read in private by his catechumen"—No one acquainted with Cyril's writing, and the other books of his time, can possibly question whether St. Matthew is included among the *four Gospels*, which he speaks of, as being read in the churches; especially considering that he frequently appeals to that evangelist's Gospel, as sacred; and in one place [g] does appeal to him, as having *wrote a Gospel in testimony of the truth of Christianity, which ought to be credited.*

2. From the council of Laodicea, Can. 59. where it is declared, " that no books which were not of the canon should be " read in the churches, and that those which were of the canon " and ought to be read, were *the Gospel according to St. Mat-* " *thew*," &c.[h]

3. From the testimony of Justin Martyr it seems not unfairly to be concluded, that *St. Matthew's Gospel was read in the primitive churches.* The proof I aim at is as followeth: That father tells us [i], that " on every Sunday there was an as- " sembly of the neighbouring Christians, and τὰ ἀπομνημονεύ- " ματα τῶν ἀποστόλων—ἀναγινώσκεται, the memoirs or commen- " taries of the apostles were read." Under this word ἀπομνημονεύματα were included those books which we now call Gospels, as is plain from what he said immediately before, viz. ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια: i. e. " in " the commentaries made by the apostles, which are called " GOSPELS:" it follows therefore, that the Gospels, which were made by the apostles, were read in the churches of Christians in the time of Justin Martyr; and that St. Matthew's Gospel was among these is most apparently evident, because Justin in many places of his writings, citing passages out of this Gospel,

[f] Τῆς δὲ καινῆς διαθήκης τὰ τέσσαρα εὐαγγέλια· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ ψευδεπίγραφα καὶ βλαβερὰ τυγχάνει—τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ· καὶ ὅσα μὲν ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε. Catech. 4. §. 22.

[g] Catech. 14. §. 8.

[h] Non oportet—libros in ecclesiis legere, qui sunt extra canonem, nisi solos canonicos Novi et Veteris Testamenti. Quæ autem oporteat legi, et in auctoritatem recipi, hæc sunt—sc. Novi Testamenti Evangelium secundum Matthæum, &c.

[i] Apolog. 2. pro Christian. p. 98.

cites them as what he read in, and learnt from, these ἀπομνημονεύμασιν τῶν ἀποστόλων, i. e. from these "Commentaries or Gos-" pels of the apostles;" i. e. from St. Matthew's Gospel, where those words only are to be found.

Arg. IV. The Gospel of St. Matthew is canonical, because *it is found among those which the churches of Syria received as such, and which they collected together, and translated as scripture in or near the apostle's time*, Prop. XV. I shall only observe further, that the author of this excellent version of the New Testament into Syriac (or some one else) at the end of St. Matthew's Gospel has annexed the following testimony, which it will not be foreign to my purpose to transcribe: هكذ اميكمي صبعا صنوزا: حصزا: ٨٨ب: ٨٧٥٥٥ صاحدا حصزا: ٨٨ب صبعا صنوزا: ٨٧٥٥٥ صاحدا; i. e. *The end of the Holy Gospel of the preaching of Matthew, which he preached in Hebrew in the land of Palestine.*

Thus I have endeavoured to establish the canonical authority of this Gospel of St. Matthew by various arguments.

CHAP. IV.

Other arguments to prove the genuine authority of St. Matthew's Gospel. Bartholomew took it to preach in his travels. Papias and Hegesippus give credit to it. The Manichees' objection against this Gospel. Faustus's objection from St. Matthew's oblique way of speech (ix. 9.) *considered and refuted. Other objections considered.*

BESIDES the preceding arguments, I have met with several other things, which seem to be no small proof of St. Matthew's Gospel being of genuine and canonical authority. These are,

1. That St. Bartholomew, who was one of our Saviour's twelve apostles, when he went forth to preach and propagate the Christian faith, *took along with him the Gospel of St. Matthew;* and particularly that *he preached according to this Gospel among the Indians, and left it among them at his departure from them:* and that Pantænus afterwards, viz. in the second century, *found this Gospel among them;* this is related both by Eusebius[k], and Jerome[l], and seems clearly to prove that St.

[k] Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 10.

[l] Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Barthol. Pantæn.

Matthew's Gospel met with a suitable reception, and was esteemed of the greatest authority even in the apostle's time.

It may indeed be objected, that the Gospel which St. Bartholomew left among the Indians, is said by Eusebius to have been written in Hebrew letters, and that I have elsewhere [m] attempted to prove that this very Gospel was that of the Nazarenes.

To which I answer, that as I have endeavoured largely to prove, that St. Matthew's Gospel was originally written in Greek [n], so I easily allow there was a very early version of it made into Hebrew; and this as yet uninterpolated nor enlarged with the Nazarene additions, is what, I suppose, St. Bartholomew, who was a Jew, and preached (as the rest of the apostles at this time) principally to those of his own nation, did take along with him in his travels.

2. That Papias, who was according to Irenæus [o] a disciple of John, and an acquaintance of Polycarp, intimates very clearly, that St. Matthew's Gospel *was in common use in his time* [p].

That Hegesippus [q], a writer of the second century, *wrote some dissertations upon the Gospel of the Hebrews, or the Gospel of St. Matthew, which the Nazarenes made use of.* Now these dissertations were wrote either upon the supposition, that this Hebrew Gospel was the true one of St. Matthew, or that it was not; if we say the *latter*, it is then evident they must be wrote with design to vindicate the authority of St. Matthew's true Gospel against the Nazarenes' copy; if the *former*, the authority of St. Matthew will be also thereby established, because all the credit, which the Nazarene Gospel had or pretended to, even among themselves, was founded upon the supposition of its being St. Matthew's; which, though false, yet shews the high opinion the primitive Christians did entertain of that evangelist's writing.

The only persons (as far as I know) among the ancients, who have made any objections against the authority of this

[m] Vol. I. Part II. Ch. X. p. 154, 155.

[n] Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel against Mr. Whiston, ch. 17, 18, 19.

[o] Adv. Hæres. lib. 5. c. 33.

[p] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39. in fine; ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ (i. e. Evangelium Matthæi) ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος.

[q] Ibid. lib. 4. c. 22.

Gospel, were the Manichees: the main and principal arguments which Faustus has made use of against it, are taken from the difficulties of the genealogy, ch. 1. But these fall not within my consideration, it being sufficient to my design to make it appear, that St. Matthew's Gospel was received as scripture by the primitive Christians: one thing only I would observe, which seems more nearly to affect its authority, viz. [r] that Faustus undertakes to prove that this Gospel was not written by St. Matthew, because of *the oblique manner of expression* (as it is called) which we meet with, Matt. ix. 9. *And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw* a man *named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom, and he saith unto* him, *Follow me; and* he *arose and followed him:* "Matthew," says Faustus, "did not write that Gospel, but some one else under "his name, as is plain by those very words of the pretended "Matthew; for who," says he, "writing concerning himself, "would say, he saw a MAN, and called HIM, and HE followed "him; and would not rather say, He saw ME, and called ME, "and I followed him?" But nothing can be more weak than this sort of arguing, it being a thing undeniable, that this oblique way of writing is common in all sorts of historians, and that they very frequently do speak of themselves not in the first, but in the third person. It is common (says Austin in his answer to [s] Faustus on this head) in secular or (what we call) profane histories. It is always done by Moses, and very frequently by our Saviour and his apostles. The many instances which that father produces, and which are every where to be met with, make it needless for me to produce any. He who has a mind may consult the many places in Moses's writings, where we find him speaking in the third person of himself, or in this oblique way of speech, viz. And the Lord said unto Moses, and Moses did such and such things; and besides these, the places both of the Old and New Testament referred to at the bottom of the page [t]. So that this argument will by no

[r] August. contr. Faust. Manich. l. 17. c. 1. Quis ergo de se ipso scribens dicat, Vidit hominem et vocavit *eum*, et secutus est *eum*, ac non potius dicat, Vidit *me*, et vocavit *me*, &c.

[s] August. contr. Faust. Manich. lib. 17. c. 4.

[t] Gen. iv. 24. Num. xxiv. 3, 4. Jerem. xxviii. 5, 10, 15. Jonah i. 1. et per tot. Matt. viii. 20. xi. 19. xviii. 2. Luke xviii. 8. John v. 23, 25, &c. John xxi. 24. Vid. August. Tract. 61. in Joann. et Glass. Gram. Sacr. lib. iv. Tract. 2. Observ. 17.

means prove what it is brought for, that Matthew did not write that Gospel which goes under his name.

The German anabaptists of the last and preceding century (persons very different in their principles and practices from those who now go under that denomination among us) and those which were called the Servetians, or followers of Michael Servetus, among other of their whimsical opinions, denied the credit and authority of this Gospel. Their principal arguments are, (1.) That the author of the Gospel *has misapplied many prophecies of the Old Testament to prove the divinity of Christ.* (2.) That the *true Gospel of St. Matthew was wrote in Hebrew, whereas this which we now have under his name seems originally to have been wrote in Greek* [u].

To the first of these my design does not oblige me to give any answer; because all I undertake to prove is, that the Gospel was received as St. Matthew's, and of as great authority in the primitive church, without any respect to the several difficulties that may be in its contexture; though it were no difficult matter to shew the falsehood of their allegation.

To the second it will be sufficient to answer, that I have elsewhere proved [x] that St. Matthew's true Gospel was not originally written in Hebrew, and that it was a mistake in the fathers to assert that it was wrote in that language, there never having been any other Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, but what was a translation out of his original Greek, and afterwards interpolated by the Nazarenes, was made use of by them as the true Gospel of this evangelist.

CHAP. V.

Concerning the time of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel. Irenæus and Eusebius differ in this matter. The opinion of the latter proved to be more probable than that of the former; viz. that he wrote A. D. 41. *and not A. D.* 59. *or* 60.

IT remains now that I say somewhat *concerning the time*, in

[u] Sixt. Senens. Bibl. Sanct. l. 7. de Evang. Matt. Hæres. p. 581.

[x] Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel, ch. xvii. xviii. xix. See also of this work, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XXIX. p. 268, &c.

which it is most probable that St. Matthew's Gospel was written; and herein I find it difficult to come to any certainty, because of the disagreement there is between the ancients themselves, as to the matter. I shall first lay down the different opinions, and then observe what appears more probable.

1. The first is that of Irenæus[y], who tells us, "that Mat-"thew published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own "language, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, "and laying the foundations of a church there." Now as I have had occasion to observe in another place, though it is not certain when Peter was at Rome, yet Paul was there in the third year of Nero; i. e. in or about the year of Christ 59. or 60. as Eusebius relates in his Chronicon; and to this most chronologers[z] and writers of church-history agree[a].

2. Eusebius in his Chronicon has placed the writing of St. Matthew's Gospel in *the third of Caligula;* i. e. *eight years after Christ's ascension*, or the year of Christ 41.

Besides these two, I know none of the writers of the first centuries who have assigned any time, in which they suppose St. Matthew to have wrote: Nicephorus[b] indeed has without any reason asserted, that "it was wrote fifteen years after "Christ's ascension;" but he being so late a writer, (viz. of the ninth century,) his testimony can deserve no regard here. As to more modern writers, I find they generally credit and follow Eusebius in this matter; nor do I know any one besides the famous Jesuit Andradius[c], Chemnitius[d], and Dr. Mill[e], who have believed Irenæus in this matter. That which influenced the first of these to his opinion was, that he thereby was able the better to support the popish doctrine *of the necessity of traditions, and the insufficiency of the scripture.* For if the Christians were without any authentic history of Christ, and St. Matthew did not write till the time which Irenæus mentions;

[y] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. cap. 1. Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ αὐτῶν διαλέκτῳ καὶ γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων καὶ θεμελιούντων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. See the Greek in Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 8.

[z] Helvicus, Petavius, Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Tallents, &c.

[a] Spanheim, Eachard, Le Clerc, &c.

[b] Lib. 2. c. 45. apud D. Cave Hist. Liter. in Matth. p. 8.

[c] Apud Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trident. pars 1. p. 28.

[d] Lib. denuo cit. p. 31.

[e] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 61, &c. I find Mr. Whiston also fixes the time of St. Matthew's writing to this same period. Essay on Constit. p. 16.

i. e. till the year of Christ 59. or 60. i. e. for the space of twenty-six or twenty-seven years, it would seem somewhat favourable to the popish scheme, viz. that religion might be propagated by mere tradition without any writing. Chemnitius, though he well refutes the Jesuit's reasonings, yet agrees with him, that Irenæus was in the right as to the time of St. Matthew's writing; because, says he, it is fit we should rather credit the more ancient, than later fathers. Dr. Mill also credits Irenæus, but without assigning the least shadow of a reason, why that father is to be credited rather. For my part, though I freely own it is difficult to come to any certainty in the point, yet I cannot but rather subscribe to Eusebius than Irenæus; i. e. I rather think St. Matthew's Gospel was written in the third year of Caligula, eight years after Christ's ascension, A. D. 41. than in the third year of Nero, six or seven and twenty years after Christ's ascension, A. D. 59. or 60. And for this opinion I shall offer the following reasons; viz.

1. Because *it is altogether improbable that the Christian churches should* for so long a space *as twenty-six or twenty-seven years after Christ's ascension, be left destitute of any genuine and authentic history of the life and actions, of the miracles and doctrines of Jesus Christ.* To suppose this, is plainly to suppose the apostles either defective in their zeal for the interest of Christianity, or else ignorant of one of the most likely means to promote it. But I find Mr. Le Clerc has prevented me on this head; I shall therefore omit saying any more on it, and give the reader a translation of his words: "[f] They "who think that the Gospels were written as late as Irenæus "saith, and suppose that for the space of about thirty years "after our Lord's ascension, there were many spurious Gos- "pels in the hands of the Christians, and not one that was "genuine and authentic, do unwarily cast a very great reflec- "tion upon the wisdom of the apostles; for what could have "been more imprudence in them, than tamely to have suffered "the idle stories concerning Christ to be read by the Chris- "tians, and not to contradict them by some authentic history "wrote by some credible persons, which might reach the know- "ledge of all men? For my part, I can never be persuaded to

[f] Hist. Eccl. Sæcul. 1. A. D. 62. §. 9. p. 414.

" entertain so mean an opinion of the prudence of men under " the conduct of the Holy Ghost. Besides, Matthew has de- " livered to us, not only the actions, but the discourses of " Christ; and this he must needs be able to do with greater " certainty, while they were fresh in his memory, than when " through length of time he began to lose the impressions of " them. It is true, the Holy Ghost was with the apostles, to " bring all things to their remembrance, which they had re- " ceived of Christ, according to the promise, John xiv. 26: " but the Holy Ghost in this matter did not only inspire, but " deal with them according to their natural powers, as the va- " riety of the expressions in the Gospel shews." Thus far he; from whence it appears very improbable, that no Gospel, which was authentic, was written before the time which Irenæus mentions, viz. the year of Christ 59. or 60. I am sensible this argument supposes, that St. Matthew's was the first true Gospel which was wrote; and that it was so, is generally asserted by all the ancients.

2. *Many of the most ancient manuscripts of this Gospel do agree with Eusebius, that St. Matthew's Gospel was wrote in the eighth year after our Saviour's ascension.* Thus, for instance, Beza[g] tells us, it was in his famous Clermont manuscript, which he gave to the university of Cambridge, and which is generally esteemed the oldest manuscript of the Gospels, which is now in the world. Thus also it is at the end of several very ancient Greek MSS. which Father Simon saw[h], and more which are cited and referred to by Dr. Mill, among the manuscripts of the Gospels in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. See Mill on Matt. xxviii. 20.

3. The old Arabic version joins in the same account; viz. *that he, St. Matthew, wrote his Gospel in Palestine, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, in Hebrew, eight years after our Lord Jesus Christ ascended in his flesh to heaven*, and the first year of the Roman emperor Claudius[i]. This differs but very little from Eusebius; for though he says it was written in the third year of Caligula, and the Arabic version in the first year

[g] Annot. in Matt. xxviii. ult.
[h] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 10.
[i] Vid. Ludov. de Dieu ad Matt. xxviii. ult.

of Claudius, yet this will prove only half a year's difference; seeing Caligula reigned but three years and a few months, and Claudius immediately succeeded him.

4. Theophylact and Euthymius *do also assert this Gospel to have been written in the eighth year after Christ's ascension;* the former in his Preface to his Exposition on Matthew; the latter in his Commentaries on the Gospels, which are in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford[k]: and though these were late writers, yet their testimony is for this reason considerable, as it coincides with the testimonies of others; which cannot be said of the opinion of Nicephorus above mentioned.

5. It may not perhaps be foreign to the purpose to observe, *how diligent and careful Eusebius was in collecting his accounts of this sort;* and that though there are some mistakes in his works, (which in so vast undertakings could hardly be avoided,) yet for the most part he is very accurate and exact, as a chronologer and historian.

6. What gives force to all the preceding remarks is, *that Irenæus is most certainly mistaken in the very next words to these;* viz. as to the time of St. Mark's writing his Gospel: he saith, that St. Mark wrote his Gospel μετὰ τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον: i. e. "after the death of Peter and Paul," as those words undoubtedly mean, and are well expressed by the old Latin Version, *post horum excessum.* But this, I say, is false, and contrary to the express assertions of many of the most ancient primitive writers, as will appear hereafter in my account of Mark. I know indeed that there have been some, who have otherwise translated these words; but this has been observed (by Valesius in Euseb. lib. 5. c. 8. Father Simon's Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 10. p. 87, 88.) to be a mistake, made by them with design to save Irenæus from the charge of contradicting the other fathers.

I will conclude the whole with adding, that whereas it was by some made an objection against this Gospel, that ecclesiastical writers differed as to the time of its being wrote, Eusebius

[k] It is cited by Dr. Mill among the Greek testimonies prefixed to St. Matthew's Gospel, in his edition of the Greek Testament.

fixing one time, and Irenæus another[l], it is answered by Sixtus Senensis in a method which that learned man thought would reconcile Irenæus and Eusebius together; viz. *That St. Matthew first published his Gospel in Judæa for the use of his countrymen, eight years after Christ's ascension, in the third year of Caligula;* and that this was what Eusebius meant; but that *the same evangelist a long time after, when he went among the Gentiles, published it more universally for the benefit of all Christians;* and that this was what Irenæus meant[m]. But I leave this conjecture to the examination of the learned in these things.

CHAP. VI.

The scripture account of St. Mark. There is no other of this name mentioned in the New Testament, but the evangelist. Objections to this answered. He was assistant to Peter and Paul in the ministry of the Gospel. The credible relations, which we have of St. Mark from the ancients, produced. Peter used him as an interpreter. Afterwards he preached in Egypt, planted many churches at Alexandria, and was one of Christ's seventy disciples.

CONCERNING St. Mark, the author of this Gospel, there is scarce any thing left us in ecclesiastical history, which can be depended upon with that certainty, which one would wish for, and have expected in such a matter.

In the writings of the New Testament we have frequent mention of one named Mark; and in the writings of the following ages there are also some few things concerning him, which may appear credible and material. I shall consider each distinctly.

I. *As to the accounts which the writings of the New Testament give of Mark.* The name is mentioned four times in the Acts of the Apostles, viz. xii. 12, 25. xv. 37, 39. thrice in St. Paul's Epistles, viz. Coloss. iv. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Philem. 24.

[l] Sixt. Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 7. De Evang. Matth. Hæres. Object. §. 3.
[m] Ibid. Dissolut. Object. §. 3.

once by St. Peter, 1 Epist. v. 13. Relating to which places I observe,

1. *That it is generally agreed, that Mark the evangelist is that Mark which is mentioned* 1 Pet. v. 13. *The church that is at Babylon elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son.* So Origen [n], Eusebius [o], and Jerome [p] among the ancients; Grotius [q], Maldonate [r], Dr. Lightfoot [s], Du Pin [t], and many other of the moderns. This is exceedingly probable for this reason; viz. that it is the universal voice of antiquity, *that Mark was Peter's companion and assistant* in preaching the Gospel, and for that reason called by him *his son*, as Paul for the same reason calls Timothy *his son* [u], and particularly says of him [x], *that as a son with a father he served with him in the Gospel.*

2. It is very probable *that Mark, mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles,* (see the places above cited,) *was the same person as Mark the evangelist, or author of this Gospel.* The reasons I assign for this, are,

(1.) *That the office of Mark the evangelist, and this Mark mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles and St. Paul's Epistles, was the very same,* viz. to be an assistant to the apostles (Paul and Peter) in the ministry of the Word. Concerning the *former*, we find Barnabas and Paul made use of him for that purpose, Acts xii. 25. And though Paul and Barnabas differed upon the point, yet the latter was for taking him to be an assistant and companion in visiting the churches, and did take him. In like manner Paul, who (as is generally agreed) was soon reconciled again to Mark, desired Timothy to *bring him to Rome to him, for* (says he) *he is useful to me* (or assisting to me) *in the work of the ministry,* 2 Tim. iv. 11. And accordingly we find he was afterwards with Paul, Coloss. iv. 10. and is there called *sister's son* (or nephew) *to Barnabas;* which is, by the way, no mean proof that he was the same person mentioned Acts xv. 37. it seeming probable, that Barnabas's affec-

[n] Exposit. in Matth. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.
[o] Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 15.
[p] Catalog. Vir. Illust. in Marco.
[q] Annot. in 1 Pet. v. 13.
[r] Prolegom. in Marc.
[s] Harmon. of the New Test. at the year 65.
[t] History of the Canon of the New Test. vol. 2. c. 2. §. 4.
[u] 1 Tim. i. 2. 2 Tim. i. 2. 1 Cor. iv. 17.
[x] Phil. ii. 22.

tion to Mark, as a relation, was one reason why he persisted in his resolution to take him along with him. But to say no more of this, it is plain Mark, mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles, was an assistant to the apostles; and the same is certain as to Mark the evangelist, viz. that he was assistant, companion, or interpreter of Peter, as will undeniably appear from the places which will presently be cited from the fathers. Unless therefore we will suppose that St. Paul's assistant and St. Peter's were both of the same name, we must conclude that the Mark mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles was one and the same person, who at different times was with Paul and Peter engaged in the same work.

(2.) To suppose two Marks, one with Peter and another with Paul, *is to breed confusion where there needeth none, and to conceive that for which the scripture giveth not only no ground, but is plain enough to the contrary.* It is easily seen how John Mark came into familiarity both with Paul and Peter; and other Mark we can find none in the New Testament, unless of our own invention. These are the words of Dr. Lightfoot [y], and seem to me to contain an argument sufficiently just, till some good proof be made that the contrary opinion is true.

(3.) *The author of the Constitutions of the Apostles*, (lib. 2. c. 57.) *makes Mark the evangelist an assistant of St. Paul;* i. e. the same who is mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles; and the latter fathers, as Œcumenius, Theophylact (Præf. in Marc.), tell us the evangelist Mark was surnamed John, and the sister's son of Barnabas, and the companion of Paul.

I know indeed that Grotius [z], and after him Cotelerius [a], Dr. Cave [b], Du Pin [c], Mr. Eachard [d], and others, are of the contrary opinion, and suppose that Mark the evangelist, and Mark mentioned in the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles, were two different persons. The two former of these have offered some reasons for their opinion, which I shall briefly consider:

1.) They urge that they cannot be the same, "because the

[y] Loc. jam cit.
[z] Prolegom. in Marc.
[a] In Constitut. Apost. lib. 2. c. 57.
[b] Lives of the Apostles, p. 214.
[c] Loc. jam cit.
[d] Ecclesiast. Hist. b. 2. c. 3. §. 4.

" ancients never call the evangelists by the name of John, but " always Mark; whereas," say they, " John was the proper " name of him who is mentioned in the Acts."

Nothing is more common than the mistakes of learned persons; but I have seldom observed one more gross than this; for,

(1. Though it is certain the surname of him mentioned in the Acts was Mark, Acts xii. 12, 25. and xv. 37. yet even the very same chapter, two verses afterwards, demonstrates (ver. 39.) that *the proper name of the person, i. e. the name by which he was commonly called, was Mark, and not John.* The words are, *Barnabas took Mark, and sailed to Cyprus.* It had been strange therefore, if persons in after-ages should have called him John.

(2. *It was the common practice among the Jews at that time, to call persons by that which was their surname, and not the other.* So, for instance, Simon, whose surname was Peter, (Matt. x. 2. Mark iii. 16. Acts x. 5, 18, 32.) was most commonly called Peter. Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus, (Matt. x. 3.) was always called Thaddeus. Joses, who was surnamed Barnabas, (Acts iv. 36.) was always called Barnabas. And so I have observed above concerning St. Matthew, that he was commonly called by his surname, viz. Levi, and so is by Mark and Luke.

(3. *In St. Paul's Epistles* (where Grotius and, I think, Du Pin acknowledge the same person is spoken of) *he is called always Mark, and not John;* though our translators awkwardly enough translate sometimes Marcus, and sometimes Mark; which must, as many other such things in our translation, confound a person unacquainted with the original.

2.) It is urged by Du Pin, *that Mark the evangelist kept close to Peter, at the time when the other* [*Mark*] *was with Paul and Barnabas.* But this is not proving, but a plain begging of the question, or taking that for granted which is the thing to be proved.

I conclude therefore for the reason above mentioned, that Mark the evangelist was the same person, as he who is mentioned not only by Peter, but in the Acts and Epistles of Paul; and this then will be all we can collect out of scripture concern-

ing him; viz. That he was an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and the son of a pious convert, whose house was employed in those persecuting times for a place of the Christian assemblies for religious worship, Acts xii. 12; that he was a person of so much visible zeal for, and knowledge in Christianity, as to be esteemed proper by Paul and Barnabas to be taken along with them, to be an assistant to them in executing their ministry, Acts xii. 25. And though upon a difference between Barnabas and Paul, about taking him with them to visit the churches, Paul declared against taking him, yet Barnabas judged his assistance necessary, Acts xv. 37, 39. That notwithstanding this, the displeasure of Paul did not continue long, for he appears to be with him at Rome, recommended him to the kind regards of the Colossians, in a letter which he wrote to them from Rome, Col. iv. 10; wanted his company another time at Rome, as a person whom he judged and found of service and great help to him in the ministry, 2 Tim. iv. 11, and accordingly honours him with the character of his *fellow-labourer*, Philem. 24. Besides all which, St. Peter styles him *his son;* i. e. one who, as a *son*, *served and helped him in the work of the Gospel*, 1 Pet. v. 13.

II. I am next to consider *the accounts we have from the ancients, relating to Mark the evangelist.*

1. These all agree, that Mark, the writer of the Gospel, *was a companion or interpreter of Peter.* So Papias[e], Irenæus[f], the author of the Hypotyposes, which went under the name of Clemens Alexandrinus, and was supposed to be his by Eusebius[g], Origen[h], Eusebius[i], Jerome[k], and many others of the fathers. Several of these add, that he was with St. Peter at Rome.

2. Another account of the ancients concerning Mark is, that he *afterwards went down to Egypt, where he preached the Gospel which he had written at Rome, and founded many churches in Alexandria, and made a vast number of converts to Christianity.* This is related by Eusebius[l], Epiphanius[m],

[e] Apud Euseb. Histor. Eccles. l. 2. c. 15. et l. 3. c. 39.
[f] Adv. Hæres. l. 3. c. 1.
[g] Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 6. c. 14.
[h] In Matth. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 6. c. 25.
[i] Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 15.
[k] Catalog. Viror. Illustr. in Marco.
[l] Histor. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 16.
[m] Vid. Epiphan. Hær. 51. §. 6.

Jerome [n], and many succeeding writers; such as Hippolytus [o], Dorotheus [p], Isidorus Hispalensis [q], Theophylact [r], &c. all which I shall pass over, only observing that the tradition of Mark's founding the church at Alexandria, which Du Pin [s] calls *an ancient and certain tradition*, was always credited in Egypt, and that Eutychius, who was made patriarch of Alexandria, A. D. 933 [t], in his Arabic history of that church published by Mr. Selden, has not only asserted the same, but given us the particular method by which the evangelist made his first convert at Alexandria, and in which he established the government of the church there. But to return to Eusebius and Jerome, they tell us that Mark was not only successful in making numerous converts, but induced them to a more than common strictness in the profession and practice of their new religion; for which reason Philo Judæus wrote a peculiar treatise concerning them and their manner of living, viz. that entitled Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ, i. e. *Concerning a contemplative Life*. I shall not now inquire, how far these two fathers and Epiphanius, who was of the same opinion, were in the right, in supposing that Philo's Essenes were Mark's Christian converts; but would refer the reader to the authors which I have elsewhere cited upon this question, and a conjecture of my own which I have in the same place proposed [u], relating to this matter.

3. Another thing delivered by the ancients to us concerning St. Mark is, *that he was one of the seventy disciples whom Christ sent forth*, Luke x. 1, &c. *and that he left Christ on account of those words of his*, Unless a man eat my flesh, and drink my blood, he is not worthy of me, John vi. 53, &c. *but that he was afterwards reclaimed by Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, and so wrote his Gospel.*——This is related by several of the old Christian writers; but it will be enough to mention the testimony of Epiphanius, who relates the story with all the

[n] Catalog. Viror. Illustr. in Marco.

[o] MS. in Bibl. Bodleian. apud D. Mill. in Testimon. Marco præfix.

[p] In Synopsi.

[q] De Vit. et Obitu Sanctorum, versus finem.

[r] Præfat. in Marc.

[s] Hist. of the Canon of the New Test. vol. 2. ch. 2. §. 4.

[t] He was also called *Said Ibn Batrick*. See Mr. Selden's preface, and Account of the Author, and Prideaux's Life of Mahomet, p. 271, 272.

[u] See above, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XVI. p. 188, &c.

mentioned particulars [x]. Grotius [y] and Dr. Cave [z] question the truth and genuineness of the tradition, because [a] Papias affirms, that *he neither heard nor followed Christ.* But to say nothing of what is objected against Papias as a witness in these cases, it is easy to answer to this argument; for Papias meant no more than that Mark was not such a disciple and follower of Christ, as to be able to form his Gospel out of his own knowledge; and this is very consistent with Epiphanius, whose account is, that Mark, though he was sent out by Christ, yet left him on occasion of his discourse, John vi. 53. i. e. almost two years before our Lord's ascension, and so could not be capable to write a history of Christ upon his own knowledge—I rather therefore incline to give credit to the tradition, and with the famous Jesuit Petavius [b] observe, that there is nothing in the circumstances of time, but what would incline a person to believe he might have seen Christ; and though Epiphanius should think differently in this matter from other fathers, (viz. Papias, and those who follow him,) yet his tradition is not to be rejected, in which he declares that Mark was of the number of the seventy-two disciples [c].

Concerning the life of Mark in other instances, as also concerning his death, I know nothing that can be said with sufficient certainty. The later writers tell us, that he travelled westward to the most desert parts of Africa, and, upon his return to Alexandria, was by the idolaters there barbarously murdered. But I choose rather to refer to the authors of those relations, than to insert them. See Dorotheus [d], Eutychius Alexandrinus in his Arabic Annals [e], with Mr. Selden's translation and commentary [f], and Isidorus Hispalensis [g], who saith that Mark died, and was *placida quiete sepultus;* and among the moderns Dr. Cave [h] and Mr. Eachard [i], who has transcribed his words. I shall only add here, that there is a constant tradition received in the Roman church, which is set down

[x] Hæres. 51. §. 6.
[y] Proleg. in Marc.
[z] Life of S. Mark, §. 1. p. 214.
[a] Apud Euseb. Histor. Eccles l. 3. c. 39.
[b] In loc. Epiphan. jam cit.
[c] So he read in his copies of Luke x. 1. as it is also in many others, viz. ἑβδομήκοντα δύο, though in the present Greek copies made use of, it is only ἑβδομήκοντα. Vid. Mill. in Luc. x. 1.
[d] In Synopsi.
[e] Pag. 38.
[f] Pag. 166—169.
[g] De Vit. et Obit. Prophet. &c. in fine.
[h] Life of St. Mark, p. 217.
[i] Eccles. Hist. b. 2. c. 6. §. 2.

as fact by Dr. Cave, " That St. Mark's body, at least the re-
" mains of it, were with great pomp removed from Alexandria
" to Venice, where they are religiously honoured, and he adopt-
" ed as the tutelar saint and patron of that state, and one of
" the richest and stateliest churches erected to his memory,
" that the world can boast of at this day." He who would see a larger account of this fabulous translation, viz. when, and by what means, the Venetian merchants procured these relics of Mark, may consult the learned Spanheim. Hist. Christ. Secul. 9. §. 5. and the authors cited by Mr. Selden, Comment. in Eutych. p. 169.

CHAP. VII.

The occasion of St. Mark's writing his Gospel, viz. the request of the church at Rome. That it was wrote under the direction of St. Peter. The places of the ancients produced, in which this is asserted. The tradition supported by several observations.

HITHERTO concerning St. Mark. I proceed now to discourse concerning his Gospel, and to produce the several accounts which we have from antiquity relating to it; which I shall consider under the three following heads, viz.

I. The occasion of its being wrote.

II. The language in which it was wrote.

III. The time of its writing.

I. *As to the occasion or cause, for which the Gospel of St. Mark was written.* This I have had occasion to observe largely elsewhere[k], but shall nevertheless particularly set down here what the ancients have delivered to us upon this head. Papias, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, the author of the Synopsis under the name of Athanasius, and Jerome, are the persons whom I mean.

Eusebius out of Papias, and the book which went under the name of the Hypotyposes of Clemens Alexandrinus, relates[l], " That when Peter, in the reign of Claudius, came to Rome,

[k] Vindic. of St. Matth. Gospel, ch. 6. p. 47.

[l] Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 15.

" and had defeated Simon Magus, the people were so inflamed " with love for the Christian truths, as not to be satisfied with " the hearing of them, unless they also had them written down. " That accordingly they with earnest entreaties applied them- " selves to Mark, a companion of Peter's, and whose Gospel " we now have, praying him that he would write down for " them, and leave with them an account of the doctrines which " had been preached to them: that they did not desist in their " request, till they had prevailed upon him, and procured his " writing of that which is now called the Gospel of MARK. " That when Peter came to know this, he was, by the direction " of [m] the Holy Spirit, pleased with the request of the people, " and confirmed the Gospel which was written for the use of " the churches." This, says Eusebius, is related by Clemens Alexandrinus, in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes, and confirmed by the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis.

The same Eusebius, in two other places of his works, relates particularly what Papias and Clemens have wrote concerning Mark's Gospel; viz.

The former says to this purpose, " that Mark, who was Pe- " ter's interpreter, exactly wrote down whatsoever he remem- " bered, though not in the same order of time, in which the " several things were said or done by Christ; for he neither " heard nor followed Christ, but was a companion of Peter, " and composed his Gospel rather with the intent of the peo- " ple's profit, than writing a regular history. So that he is in " no fault, if he in some things wrote according to his memory, " he designing no more than to omit nothing which he had " heard, and to relate nothing false [n]."

The latter, viz. the Hypotyposes ascribed to Clemens Alexandrinus [o], relate, that, according to a tradition of the former presbyters, the Gospel of Mark was wrote on the following occasion, viz. " When Peter was publicly preaching the Gospel " in Rome, by the influences of the Holy Spirit, many of the " converts there desired Mark, as having been a long compan-

[m] This passage is very ill translated by Valesius, the words ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, being to be referred, not to Peter's knowing the fact, which needed no divine revelation, but to his approving the book.

[n] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 39.

[o] Apud ejusdem Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 14.

" ion of Peter, and who well remembered what he preached, to " write down his discourses; that upon this he composed his " Gospel, and gave it to those who made this request, which " when Peter knew, he neither obstructed nor encouraged the " work."

Irenæus[p] only says, " that after the death of Peter and " Paul, who had been preaching at Rome, Mark, the disciple " and interpreter of Peter, wrote down what he had heard him " preach."

Origen[q] adds, " that Mark wrote his Gospel according to " the dictates or directions of Peter."

The author of the Synopsis under the name of Athanasius, saith the same as the last.

Jerome[r] tells us, that Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, " wrote a short Gospel from what he had heard of " Peter, at the request of the brethren at Rome, which when " Peter knew, he approved and published it in the churches, " commanding the reading of it by his own authority."

These are the relations of the ancients, concerning the occasion of St. Mark's writing his Gospel; as to which I would offer the following remarks.

1. That they all agree, that St. Mark *wrote what he heard or learnt from St. Peter.*

2. *That Eusebius makes Clemens Alexandrinus directly to contradict himself in this matter:* for whereas he in one place (viz. lib. 2. c. 15.) saith, " that Clemens testifies Peter's appro- " bation of the church of Rome's request to Mark to write, as " also of the Gospel written:" in another he saith, (viz. lib. 6. c. 14.) " that Peter neither obstructed nor encouraged Mark in " his undertaking." This is so plain a contradiction, that I know not how it can be reconciled. Valesius has indeed attempted a reconciliation[s], viz. " That Peter privately approved " it, but not publicly;" but no one, who considers the words, can be satisfied with this. I doubt not but the former place is the true one, and that St. Peter did approve the writing of Mark, because so many of the primitive writers assert it; and if we

[p] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 1.

[q] Exposit. in Matt. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 25.

[r] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Marco.

[s] Annot. in Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 14. See Father Simon, Crit. Hist. New Test. part 1. c. 10.

will suppose Jerome to have looked into this book of Clemens, which he cites, the matter will be past doubt; for he saith, that there it was said, that "this Gospel was approved and delivered to the churches to be read by Peter." Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Marco.

3. It seems more probable *that Mark wrote his Gospel from what he could remember of Peter's discourses concerning Christ,* than *from the immediate dictatings of that apostle;* for most of the accounts above suppose Peter ignorant of his writing, till after he had wrote. See Cotelerius's conjecture to the same purpose; Not. in Constit. Apostolic. lib. 2. c. 57. and Vales. in Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 39.

4. That which is by all writers on this subject cited as the testimony of Papias, ought not to be looked upon so much to be his, as the testimony of *John the Elder;* for it is not only declared by Papias, that "he had all traditions of this sort from "Aristion and John the Elder," but he introduces this very testimony thus, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγε; i. e. "and this the "elder [John] said," viz. *that Mark, the interpreter of Peter,* &c.

5. St. Mark's character, as interpreter of St. Peter, does not imply *that apostle to have been destitute of the gift of tongues.* The word ἑρμηνευτὴς denotes an expositor, not only of an unknown language, but of any thing else unknown; and in this sense Mark was properly Peter's interpreter, as he was made use of particularly to explain to the people, what the apostle had more largely preached. Dr. Cave has another way of accounting for the matter; viz. "That though the apostles were "divinely inspired, and among other miraculous powers had "the gift of languages conferred upon them, yet was the interpretation of tongues a gift more peculiar to some than others. "This," says he, "might probably be St. Mark's talent in expounding St. Peter's discourses, whether by word or writing, "to those who understood not the language wherein they were "delivered [t]."

6. *There are some evidences in the Gospels now received, that St. Mark's Gospel was written according to the preaching or discourses of Peter, or that the accounts, which we have*

[t] Life of St. Mark, p. 214.

from the ancients, are true. This I gather from a remark, which I have elsewhere made[u], and endeavoured to support by proper arguments, viz. *That there are in the Gospel history, several very remarkable circumstances relating to, and in favour of St. Peter, which are related by the other evangelists, and not so much as mentioned, or hinted at by St. Mark.* The reason of which seems to be, that as St. Peter's modesty would not allow him to publish and preach them, so neither would he suffer them to be inserted in a Gospel, which was to go into the world with his approbation, and even under his name. The passages in the Gospel, to which I refer, are several, that seem very much to St. Peter's advantage, and tend to his superiority or advancement above the rest of the apostles; which as that apostle would decline from in preaching, so would he not encourage to be written, and consequently as they are in the other Gospels, and not in St. Mark, seem clearly to intimate to us, that St. Mark wrote from the preaching of Peter. I have in the book last cited collected several of these instances, which, for the sake of the curious in these studies, I shall here set down, viz.

A Catalogue of several places in the Gospel history, which relate things tending to St. Peter's honour, which are not mentioned by St. Mark in his Gospel.

I. *The account of Christ's pronouncing Peter blessed, when he had confessed him; his declaring that he had his faith and knowledge from God; his promise of the keys and of that large power, which is made to him,* &c. are omitted by St. Mark, though the former and succeeding parts of this discourse are both told by him. See Matt. xvi. 16—20. compared with Mark viii. 29, 30.

II. *The relation of St. Peter's being commissioned by Christ to work the miracle, by getting money out of the fish's mouth to pay the tribute money,* is told by St. Matthew, ch. xvii. 24, &c. but omitted by St. Mark, though the preceding and subsequent stories are the very same as in St. Matthew. See Mark ix. 30—33.

III. *Christ's particular expressions of love and favour to*

[u] Vindication of St. Matthew's Gospel, ch. 6. p. 48, &c.

St. Peter, in telling him of his danger, and that he prayed particularly for him, that his faith might not fail, is omitted by St. Mark, but related Luke xxii. 31, 32.

IV. *St. Peter's remarkable humility above the rest of the apostles, expressed in an unwillingness that Christ should wash his feet, which none of the rest did express, with Christ's particular discourse to him,* &c. John xiii. 6, &c. is omitted by Mark.

V. *The instance of St. Peter's very great zeal for Christ, when he was taken, in cutting off the high priest's servant's ear,* John xviii. 10. is not mentioned by St. Mark in particular, but only told in general of a certain person that stood by, Mark xiv. 47.

VI. *St. Peter's faith, in leaping into the sea to go to Christ,* John xxi. 7. is not mentioned by St. Mark.

VII. *Christ's discourse with Peter, concerning his love to him, and his particular repeated charge to him to feed his sheep,* John xxi. 15. is omitted by St. Mark.

VIII. *Our Saviour's predicting to Peter his martyrdom, and the manner of it,* John xxi. 18, 19. is not related by St. Mark.

These are some instances of things tending to St. Peter's honour, recorded by the other evangelists, none of which are so much as hinted at by St. Mark. I add also, that there is not any one single instance in all his Gospel, like to those mentioned, or which tends to advance the honour and prerogative of Peter above the rest of the apostles; all which cannot be accounted for by any way more probable, than supposing that the apostle did not publish those circumstances which were so much in his favour. In this remark I have the pleasure to join with Eusebius, and the learned Doway professor, Estius, whose words are to this purpose: "Why," says he, "St. Mark "should omit in his Gospel those great and honourable pro- "mises made to St. Peter, which we read Matt. xvi. may be "seen in Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang. lib. 3. c. 7. St. Peter's "humility would not suffer him to tell these things to St. Mark, "when he was writing his Gospel. It is remarkable that the "three other evangelists relate those things, which tend to ad- "vance the honour and prerogative of St. Peter; only St. Mark,

" who wrote his Gospel according to what he heard from St. " Peter, hath omitted them; which evidences the great mo- " desty of the apostle [x]."

Dr. Hammond has another argument, by which he endeavours to prove the truth of the account, given by the ancients, of St. Mark's writing under the direction of Peter [y]. After he had produced the account, he adds; " And of this there be " some characters discernible in the writing itself, as that, set- " ting down the story of Peter's denying Christ with the same " enumeration of circumstances, and aggravations of the fault, " that Matthew doth, when he comes to mention his repent- " ance, and tears consequent to it, he doth it, as became the " true penitent, *more coldly* than Matthew had done, only " ἔκλαιε, *he wept;* whereas Matthew hath ἔκλαιε πικρῶς, *he wept* " *bitterly.*"

7. It is no small proof that the ancients' account of St. Mark's writing his Gospel under the direction of, or from Peter is true, that *the Gospel went under the name of Peter*, and was styled the Gospel of Peter, being thought to be wrote by him. This we are expressly told by Tertullian [z], and not obscurely by Justin Martyr [a], as I shall shew hereafter.

8. *If the word* Babylon, 1 Pet. v. 13. *be put for* Rome, as is generally thought by the ancients [b], all the popish writers, and many protestants; we have then hence a further confirmation of the truth of the ancients' account of the occasion of St. Mark's writing, viz. his writing from Peter's direction at Rome; viz. it will hence appear, that St. Mark was with Peter at Rome, and that he made use of him in the service of the Gospel, because he calls him his son—The words are, *The church which is at Babylon* [at Rome], *elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Mark my son,* (or assistant in the Gospel-work.)

[x] In difficil. Script. loca, in Marc. viii. 29.

[y] Annot. on the title of Matthew.

[z] Evangelium, quod Marcus edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus. Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5.

[a] Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 333.

[b] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 15. Hieron. Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Marco, et alii passim.

CHAP. VIII.

Concerning the language in which St. Mark wrote his Gospel. The arguments of Baronius and Bellarmine, to prove that he wrote in Latin, refuted. Concerning the time of St. Mark's writing. Two different opinions proposed. St. Peter was at Rome. When he came first thither; viz. not till the ninth or tenth of Nero, or the year of Christ, 63. or 64.

THUS I have given the best account I can of the original of St. Mark's Gospel, and added such remarks as appear to me illustrating and confirming of it. I proceed now to consider,

II. *In what language this Gospel of St. Mark was written.*

Besides Baronius and Bellarmine, and a few zealous papists who have followed them, I know no one but subscribes to the common report of antiquity, that St. Mark wrote in Greek. These cardinals pretend *he wrote in Latin;* but nothing can be pretended upon more weak arguments: all their reasoning may be reduced to the three following heads, which I shall briefly refute;

1. They urge, *that St. Mark, writing his Gospel at Rome, must be supposed to write it in the language which was most in use there at that time;* i. e. in Latin. But it is easy to reply,

(1.) That the *Greek language was very much known and in use at Rome when St. Mark wrote.* This was the universal language, as Cicero, Seneca [c], and other writers of that time, assure us; and even the very women at Rome spake in that language [d].

(2.) The converts at Rome were, for the most part, of the Jews, (as they also were in other countries [e],) and these generally understood Greek, and made use of the Greek Bibles. Grotius's words are as remarkable as true [f]; "The Jews, who

[c] Orat. pro Arch. Poet. §. 23. Senec. Consolat. ad Helv. c. 6.

[d] See Du Pin's Canon of the New Test. ch. 2. §. 4. p. 42.

[e] See above, Vol. I. Part I. Ch. II. p. 23.

[f] Græce autem scripsit Marcus, quanquam in gratiam præcipue Romanorum, sicut et Paulus ad Romanos Epistolam Græca scripsit lingua; quia Judæi qui Romæ agebant, plerique Latini sermonis ignari, longa per Græciam et Asiam habitatione Græcam linguam didicerant, et Romanorum vix quisquam erat non Græce intelligens. Annot. in Titul. Marci.

" dwelt at Rome, were for the most part ignorant of the Latin " tongue, but by means of their long abode in Asia and Greece, " had learnt the Greek; and of which language there were " scarce any of the Romans ignorant."

(3.) Hence St. Paul, writing an Epistle to the Romans, *wrote it in Greek, and not in Latin.*

2. It is urged, that *there are several Latin words made Greek in St. Mark's Gospel*, and thence concluded, that the whole Gospel was wrote in Latin.

What can be more absurd? The argument proves nothing, unless it be the directly contrary to what it is brought for. He who was translating out of Latin into Greek, can never be supposed to put Latin words for Latin words. Accordingly Dr. Mill has justly made this an argument to prove St. Mark wrote first in Greek[g]; and there are Latin words in each of the evangelists, as well as Mark.

3. It is urged, that the Syriac, Arabic, and Persic versions affirm St. Mark to have wrote in Latin. To which I answer,

(1.) That these epigraphs, or postscripts, at the end of these versions, are of very uncertain authority.

(2.) That the Arabic and Persic versions are generally agreed, by those who have examined them, *to be made out of the Syriac version;* and Lud. de Dieu has, by a very ingenious and solid criticism on the epigraph at the end of the Arabic version of Mark, proved that version to be very late.

(3.) That the epigraph of the Syriac version does not affirm Mark to have wrote in Latin, as is generally taken for granted, but only saith, that he *spoke and preached in Latin at Rome*; the words are, صلى وعلم *He spake his Gospel, and preached it.*

As to the testimony of Eutychius Alexandrinus, urged by Baronius, to prove St. Mark to have wrote in Latin, I think there is nothing needful to be said, he being so late a writer; and besides, Mr. Selden[h] has largely shewn that the Arabic word رومية *Romana,* may be very well taken to denote the Greek language, and then Eutychius's testimony will be, that

[g] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 111.
[h] Comment. in Eutych. Orig. Alex. p. 152.

Mark wrote in Greek. Concerning this whole matter, see Father Simon's Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. ch. 11.

III. It remains that some inquiry *be made into the time* when St. Mark wrote his Gospel. In this matter it is exceeding difficult to come to any clear determination. That which occasions the difficulty, is the uncertainty we are under as to the time when St. Peter came to Rome. Some have absolutely denied that he ever was there; and as they endeavour from scripture to shew, that during the reigns of Tiberius, Caligula, and Claudius, he was either at Jerusalem, Samaria, or Antioch; so from St. Paul's Epistles, which were written from Rome, and that which was written to Rome, all of them in the reign of Nero, they finding no salutations sent to Peter, nor from Peter, they conclude, that he never was at Rome [i]. But these seem to be arguments too weak to counterbalance the universal testimony of antiquity: there is scarce any fact which is more generally attested; so that for my part, I know not how to deny St. Peter's having been at Rome, without asserting at the same time, that the most universal concurrence of the primitive Christians in relating a fact, is not to be depended upon. The question therefore before us now is, *When St. Peter was at Rome?* I shall briefly lay down the differing opinions, and then what appears more probable.

1. The popish writers generally assert, that St. Peter came to *Rome in the second year of Claudius, or the year of Christ* 44 [k]. This is well known: the foundation of their opinion is, that Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History [l], saith; "Peter, by "the direction of Providence, came to Rome in the reign of "Claudius, to contend with, and overcome Simon Magus;" and in his Chronicon, that "after he had been at Antioch, he "went to Rome, in the second year of Claudius," i. e. *the year of Christ* 44. Those who are of this opinion, suppose the Gospel of St. Mark to be written at this time, as Eusebius seems also to have thought; and so it is asserted at the end of the Arabic version [m], and of many ancient manuscripts of this

[i] See Bunting's Itinerar. tot. Script. in English, p. 496.

[k] Vid. inter alios Dionys. Petav. Rationar. Tempor. par. 1. lib. 5. c. 3. et Achill. Primin. Gassar. Epit. Hist. et Chronic. Mundi, p. 93.

[l] Lib. 2. c. 14.

[m] Vid. Lud. de Dieu in Marci cap. ult.

Gospel, particularly one mentioned by Dr. Hammond [n], two referred to by Father Simon [o], and thirteen cited by Dr. Mill [p], as it is also by Theophylact [q], and others of the Greek scholiasts.

2. Most protestants, and some learned writers among the papists, *suppose Peter's coming to Rome not to have been till many years after*, viz. not till Nero's reign, and the ninth or tenth year of that reign, i. e. about the year of Christ 63 or 64. The foundations of this opinion are,

(1.) That St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans *does not salute Peter*, though he spends almost a whole chapter in saluting particular persons at Rome, and this Epistle is supposed to be wrote about the year 53, or after, viz. in the end of Claudius's reign [r].

(2.) That upon St. Paul's coming to Rome first, which was about the year of Christ 58 or 59, viz. in the beginning of Nero, *he neither met with Peter there, nor any signs of his having been there;* but on the contrary, found the people there ignorant of, and much unacquainted with Christianity [s]. See Acts xxviii. 21, 22, &c. 28.

For my own part, I cannot but suspect the validity of this argument in part; for it is certain, that, before St. Paul's coming to Rome, there were many converts made there to the Christian religion. The Epistle to the Roman converts, was wrote four or five years before Paul was at Rome; and when he came there, the brethren met him, some at Appii Forum, some at the Three Taverns, Acts xxviii. 15. yet, on the other hand, all this may be supposed, without any apostle's having been there to preach to them; for the Gospel having been now preached five or six and twenty years, it is no way unreasonable to suppose it should in this time reach Rome, where there was a general conflux of all sorts of people. See Dr. Whitby on Acts xxviii. 15.

(3.) *That Paul makes no mention of Peter in any one of those Epistles which he wrote from Rome to the churches;*

[n] Annot. in Titul. Matth.
[o] Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 10.
[p] In Marc. cap. ult.
[q] Præfat. in Marc.
[r] See Dr. Cave's Life of Peter, sect. 11.
[s] Cleric. Hist. Eccles. secul. 1. ad ann. 61. p. 412. and Dr. Cave loc. cit.

which in all probability he would have done, had Peter been there [t] any part of that time.

(4.) That on the contrary, in his Epistle from Rome to the Colossians, St. Paul tells them, *that (of the Jews) Mark, sister's son to Barnabas, and Jesus, called Justus, were the only fellow-labourers which he had in promoting the kingdom of God*, Col. iv. 10, 11. This evidently excludes Peter [u].

These, with some other reasons, make it evident to me, that St. Peter was not at Rome till the ninth or tenth year of Nero; i. e. till the year of Christ 63 or 64, and consequently that the Gospel of St. Mark was not written before this time, but between this and the martyrdom of this apostle and St. Paul at Rome, i. e. the year of Christ 67 or 68, which happened at the same time. See the testimonies of Caius in his book against Proculus, and Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, in his Epistle to the Romans, to this purpose, both of whom lived in the second century [x]. I shall only add, that in the small tract of Lactantius, *concerning the death of persecutors*, we read, "that "Peter came to Rome during Nero's reign, and made a great "many converts there, and so formed a church in this place of "the empire; which account," says bishop Burnet in the preface to his English translation of this tract [y], "cuts off the fable "of Peter's having been there for five and twenty years;" i. e. from the second year of Claudius, or the forty-fourth year of Christ; and that in the Arabic Annals of Eutychius Alexandrinus, published by Mr. Selden, the time of writing this Gospel is said to have been in Nero's reign. His words are in English thus: "In the time of Nero Cæsar, Peter, the chief "of the apostles, wrote the Gospel of Mark together with "Mark, in the Latin [Greek] tongue, in the city of Rome, but "he gave the title of it to Mark."

[t] Cleric. Hist. Eccles. secul. 1. ad ann. 62. p. 422. et ad ann. 68. p. 447. Cave, ubi supra. Eachard's Eccles. Hist. b. 2. c. 6. §. 5.

[u] Cave et Cleric. loc. cit.

[x] Apud Euseb. Hist. Ecclesiast. lib. 2. c. 25.

[y] Pag. 4. Le Clerc, secul. 1. ad ann. 68. p. 448. (though I confess I know not upon what grounds) tells us this book was not wrote (as its editor Baluzius, and translator bishop Burnet supposed) by Lactantius, but L. Cæcilius.

CHAP. IX.

St. Mark's Gospel proved to be canonical. It is in all the ancient catalogues of sacred books. It is cited as scripture by the primitive fathers. It was read in their churches. It is in the Syriac collection, or version. Objections against its authority answered. The last chapter of this Gospel proved to be genuine and authentic.

I COME now to establish the canonical authority of this Gospel, which I shall endeavour by the following arguments.

Arg. I. The Gospel of St. Mark is of canonical authority by Prop. IV. because *it is in all the catalogues of canonical books, which we have among the writings of the primitive Christians.* These catalogues I have collected and referred to Vol. I. Part I. Ch. VIII. viz. the catalogue of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Ruffin, Austin, the third council of Carthage, and the author of the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. To which I add the general proof I have above made in this Part, that the four Gospels only, which we now receive, were received by the first churches of Christians, and approved as scripture, viz. the three first by St. John the evangelist, and the four together by Polycarp, Tatian, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, &c. See above in this Part the previous dissertation.

Arg. II. The Gospel of St. Mark is of canonical authority, because *it is cited as scripture in the writings of the primitive Christians*, by Prop. V. How largely and frequently St. Matthew's Gospel was appealed to by them, we have already seen; and if we do not find St. Mark as often cited, it cannot be thought strange, because the far greatest part of St. Mark's Gospel, and what is related in it, is also related by St. Matthew. I shall however produce the several places which I have observed.

1. *In the writings* (as they are called) *of the apostolic fathers, I have not observed any places of this Gospel referred to, which are not also in St. Matthew*, and accordingly set down above, as being taken out of that Gospel, though perhaps several of them were taken out of St. Mark. I shall therefore

refer the reader to the collection or catalogue of the citations made by these fathers out of St. Matthew.

2. *In Justin Martyr's works the case is the same as in the apostolic fathers;* only *one place* I have observed, in which he cites something which is in St. Mark's Gospel, and not in St. Matthew's. The place I mean is (Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 333.) where he saith, Καὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν τὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ γεγενημένον: i. e. "It is said that he changed the name of one of "his apostles into Peter; and the fact is related in *his* Com- "mentaries or Gospel." This is not in Matthew; but in Mark iii. 16. we read, Καὶ ἐπέθηκε τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον: i. e. *And Simon he surnamed Peter.* It is plain therefore that Justin had seen St. Mark's Gospel; and though indeed this be also related by Luke, (vi. 14.) yet it is to me evident he cited Mark, and not Luke, because he says it is written ἐν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ: i. e. in his Commentaries, viz. the *Commentaries or Gospel of Peter*, whom he had just named, and to whom the word αὐτοῦ is undoubtedly to be referred, and not to Christ.

(1.) Because Justin Martyr, though he very *often mentions* the ἀπομνημονεύματα, or Commentaries of the apostles, *never once mentions* the ἀπομνημονεύματα of Christ.

(2.) Because *it is certain the Gospel of Mark went at that time under the name of Peter.* This I have above proved out of Tertullian.

(3.) Because (if I mistake not) *it would not be very elegant Greek to write* ἀπομνημονεύματα Χριστοῦ; this would be just the same as to call the Gospels in Latin, *Libri* or *Commentarii Christi*, instead of *Libri* or *Commentarii de Christo.*

III. IRENÆUS.

St. MARK'S *Gospel.*	*The Works of* IRENÆUS.
1 Ch. i. 1, &c.	1 Lib. 3. adv. Hæres. c. 11, 18.
2 —— 24.	2 Lib. 4. adv. Hæres. c. 14.
3 Ch. ix. 23.	3 —— c. 72.
4 —— 44, 46, 48.	4 Lib. 2. c. 56.
5 Ch. xiii. 32.	5 —— c. 48.
6 Ch. xvi. 17, 18. cited together with Luke x. 19.	6 —— c. 36.
7 ——— 19.	7 Lib. 3. c. 11.

Note here,

1. That in the first and last of these places Mark *is cited by name.*

2. *That in every one else what is cited is in his Gospel, and not in the others*, except one place which is in Luke.

3. That I have omitted all those places *where there is the same in Matthew and Mark, though there is equal reason to suppose*, that Irenæus referred to Mark, as to Matthew.

IV. Clemens Alexandrinus.

He has undoubtedly in several places of his Pædagogus and Stromata, (viz. the works which are usually bound together under his name,) cited St. Mark's Gospel; but inasmuch as he has not, that I have found, cited it by name, nor produced any places but what are in St. Matthew's Gospel too, I thought a collection of them would be needless; only I would observe, that in his little tract, entitled, *Quis Dives Salvetur?* he has cited a long paragraph out of this Gospel, viz. from ver. 17. of the tenth chapter to ver. 32. Ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μάρκον εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται, "These things," says he, "are written in the "Gospel according to Mark," (vid. cap. 4, 5.)

V. Tertullian

Appears plainly to have made use of St. Mark's Gospel, and has many times cited out of it that which is not in any other, and sometimes that which is. I have collected the following instances.

St. Mark's *Gospel.*	Tertullian's *Works.*
1 Ch. i. 2.	1 Adv. Jud. c. 9. It is true Tertullian seems there to cite the prophet Malachi iii. 1. but it is very evident he made use of Mark; for he has followed Mark's words, which are different both from the Hebrew and all the Greek copies of the LXX. In the Hebrew it is, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way לפני i. e. *before me;*

St. Mark's *Gospel.*	Tertullian's *Works.*
1 Ch. i. 2.	and so in the LXX. πρὸ προσώπου μου, i. e. *before me,* whereas Mark has it πρὸ προσώπου σου, and ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου, i. e. *before thy face,* and *before thee;* and in this Tertullian follows him, *ante faciem tuam, qui præparabit viam tuam ante te;* i. e. *before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee;* which are the very words of Mark, not only differing from, but larger than either the Hebrew or LXX.
2 Ch. i. 24.	2 Lib. adv. Prax. c. 26.
3 Ch. iii. 7.	3 Lib. de Pudicit. c. 21.
4 Ch. v. 9.	4 Lib. de Animâ, c. 25. et de Fugâ, in Persecut. c. 2.
5 Ch. vii. 3.	5 Lib. de Baptism. c. 15. Vid. Pamel. in loc.
6 Ch. viii. 38.	6 Lib. de Carne Christi. c. 5. et de Præscript. adv. Gnost. c. 9.
7 Ch. xiv. 13.	7 Lib. de Baptism. c. 19.
8 Ch. xvi. 9.	8 Lib. de Animâ, c. 25.
9 ——— 19.	9 Lib. adv. Prax. c. 30.

These are some places in which Tertullian made use of St. Mark's Gospel, none of which are to be found in St. Matthew; so that it is as probable he cited this Gospel in those places which are the same in it and St. Matthew's, as that he cited St. Matthew's; and if so, it would be easy to produce almost half a hundred instances more.

It would be a superfluous task and endless labour to go, in like manner as above, through all the writers of the first four centuries, and collect the citations which they have made of this Gospel. Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Jerome, Austin, &c. have made too many references to this Gospel to require a collection of them; besides, several of the fathers of

these times have wrote Commentaries or Homilies upon this Gospel, as on the other parts of scripture; which, with what is already said, is enough to evince its canonical authority by Prop. V.

Arg. III. The Gospel of St. Mark is of canonical authority (by Prop. VI.), because *it was read as scripture among the other books of sacred scripture in the assemblies or churches of the primitive Christians.* This will be evident to every one who will consult Cyril of Jerusalem, the fifty-ninth canon of the council of Laodicea, as above referred to Part I. Ch. X. and in this Part above, concerning St. Matthew, Chap. III. where it is also shewn, that in Justin Martyr's time the Gospels were wont to be read in the churches; and as Justin did esteem St. Mark's Gospel to be a true one, and cited it as such, there can be no reason to question but he includes this among those other ἀπομνημονεύματα, or memoirs of the apostles, which were read in the churches.

Arg. IV. St. Mark's Gospel is canonical, because *it was esteemed so by the churches of Syria in or near the apostles' time, and accordingly by them in those days translated, and inserted in their collection of sacred books;* Prop. XV. At the end of this Gopel in Syriac we accordingly read,

ܣܦܪ ܐܘܢܓܠܝܘܢ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܪܩܘܣ ܕܐܡܪ ܘܟܪܙ ܒܠܫܢܐ ܪܘܡܝܐ ܒܪܘܡܝ

i. e. *The end of the holy Gospel of the preaching of Mark, which he spake and preached in Latin at Rome.*

Having thus endeavoured to establish the canonical authority of this Gospel of St. Mark, I shall now briefly consider that which has been or may be objected against it.

1. It may seem a very considerable objection against this Gospel and its authority, *that it seems to be only an epitome, or abridgment of St. Matthew's Gospel.*

To this I answer, that were the fact certain, and it could be made appear, that St. Mark did transcribe his Gospel out of St. Matthew's, it would very much weaken its authority, and lessen the credit of its inspiration. This I have elsewhere more largely observed, (viz. Vindicat. of St. Matthew's Gospel, ch. 10.) and shewn how absurd it is to suppose a person under the conduct of inspiration, transcribing or stealing out of an-

other's labours. The little necessity there is for inspiration in such a case is no mean argument that there was none at all. What need had a man of the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to read and write out here and there a piece of a history, where he had a mind? How odd is it to say, The Holy Spirit inspired one person to write a history, and then inspired another to abridge it! i. e. The Holy Spirit thought fit at first to have so much wrote, but then afterwards that it should not be quite so much, but the superfluities of his first work should be left out. Further, as the supposing St. Mark an epitomiser of St. Matthew lessens the credit of inspiration, so it detracts from the honour and usefulness of St. Mark's work. It is little better than to say, this Gospel was stolen, and the author a plagiary; and accordingly Ruffin in the fourth century, and some bigoted papists since, have called it *religiosum furtum*, a religious theft, or pious fraud[z]. Accordingly Spinoza[a] and Father Simon have by this very means attempted to ruin the credit of the books of the Old Testament, viz. by asserting them to be only extracts out of larger records now lost. All this and much more would follow, if we suppose St. Mark's Gospel an epitome of St. Matthew's; but the truth is, the world hath been mistaken entirely in the fact; and though some among the ancients, and almost all later writers have asserted it, *it is utterly false*, and most evident that St. Mark did not abridge St. Matthew, as I have in another book proved, by such arguments as appear to me undeniably conclusive; which I shall think it sufficient to refer the reader to[b], with what is above said in this work, Part I. Ch. XIII. Prop. XIV.

II. It is objected, *that Mark himself was not an apostle and eyewitness of what he wrote, but only a companion of the apostles, and consequently his Gospel is, and ought to be of no more authority than the writings of Barnabas, Clemens, or any other companion of the apostles.* This is urged by Mr. Toland, Amynt. p. 47, 48. His words are, "If they think "them (viz. the Epistle of Barnabas, Clemens, &c.) ge- "nuine, why do they not receive them into the canon of scrip-

[z] See Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trident. pars 1. p. 34.

[a] Tract. Theolog. Polit. c. 8. and c. 9. in init.

[b] Vindicat. of St. Matthew, c. 6, &c.

" tures, since they were the companions and fellow-labourers " of the apostles, as well as St. Mark and St. Luke? If this " quality was sufficient to entitle the two last to inspiration, " why should it not do as much for the two first? And if this " be not all the reason, pray let us know the true one, having " never heard of any other."

To all this I answer;

1. That St. Mark is *not received as canonical*, only because *he was a companion of the apostles*, but because *he wrote under the direction of an inspired apostle, St. Peter; and who*, as Eusebius saith, *approved the book* ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, i. e. *by the revelation of the Holy Ghost*[c].

2. That St. Mark's Gospel *was approved by St. John*, as I have above shewn; see the Dissertation prefixed to this Part.

3. That *it was received by the primitive churches as canonical*, was read in their assemblies, and cited in their writings as scripture; which cannot be proved of Clemens, Barnabas, &c.

4. That it contains nothing false or fabulous; which I have proved above, Part III. Ch. XLI. &c., that the Epistle of Barnabas doth, and shall hereafter prove of Clemens.

It would scarce be justice to St. Mark, and the subject which I have now in hand, if I should finish it without observing, that whatever has been surmised to the contrary, *the last chapter of this Gospel is equally canonical with any other part.* The matter has been controverted, and there have been those who have thought it should be excluded from the canon; I mean not the whole chapter, (as many, Erasmus, Beza, Drusius, &c. *in loc.* have falsely understood the question,) but only that part of it which is after the words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ, i. e. *after the end of the eighth verse.* The reason of this controversy is, that Jerome in a letter to Hedibia, who desired him to reconcile the differences between the evangelists Matthew and Mark, about our Saviour's resurrection, answers, " That there " were two ways of solving the difficulty, viz. Either we must " reject the testimony of Mark, *which is in few copies of his* " *Gospel, almost all the Greek copies wanting this section in* " *the end of his Gospel, besides that it seems different from, and*

[c] Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 15.

"*contrary to the accounts of the other evangelists*, &c[d]." (The other answer I need not mention.) And besides Jerome, Gregory Nyssene says, this last section was wanting in several, "and those the most exact copies[e]." Besides, Father Simon declares[f], that he saw two ancient Greek manuscripts in the French king's library, and one in Monsieur Colbert's, in each of which was inserted a note in Greek to this purpose, "that "what followed after ver. 8. in this last chapter of Mark was "only to be found in some copies." Dr. Mill has mentioned some old Greek scholiasts, viz. Euthymius, Victor Antiochenus, and an anonymous writer, who says the same[g]. But to all this I answer, and will endeavour to shew, that this last part of the Gospel of St. Mark is equally authentic with the rest; for,

1. Though Jerome says this section was not in most of the Greek copies of this Gospel, yet *he himself seems not to have rejected it*, because he endeavours afterwards to reconcile Matthew and Mark together.

2. Because Irenæus (lib. 3. c. 11.) *has cited the nineteenth verse of this chapter, which is the last except one*, and introduces it thus; *In fine autem evangelii ait Marcus:* from whence it is evident, that the whole chapter was in his copy of Mark.

3. Athanasius[h] and Austin[i] have also cited this part of St. Mark's Gospel.

4. *All the Greek manuscripts which are in the world have this part of St. Mark's Gospel.* Erasmus[k] and Beza[l] declare, it was in all the ancient manuscripts which they had seen.

5. *All the ancient versions extant, Syriac, Latin, and* (as I find by De Dieu's Commentary) *Arabic, have it.*

[d] Hujus quæstionis duplex est solutio: aut enim non recipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur evangeliis, omnibus Græcis libris pæne hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus; præsertim quum diversa atque contraria evangelistis cæteris narrare videatur: aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque verum dixerit, &c. Epist. ad Hedib. qu. 3.

[e] Apud Mill. Not. in Marc. xvi. 8. et Fabric. Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. tom. 1. p. 326. *who has observed after Combefisius, who published them, and Dr. Cave's Hist. Liter.* p. 443. *that those two orations,* de Resurrectione Christi, *under the name of Gregory Nyssene, were made by Hesychius Hierosolymitanus.*

[f] Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 11.

[g] Loc. jam cit.

[h] In Synops.

[i] De Consens. Evang. l. 3. c. 24.

[k] Annot. in Mar. xvi. 14.

[l] Ibid. xvi. 9.

6. Grotius[m] well argues, that *it was very improbable St. Mark would omit the history of our Saviour's resurrection, which is one of the most considerable parts of the Gospel history.*

7. The same learned critic assigns this probable reason of this section being wanting in some Greek copies, viz. "It was "left out with design, because it seemed to contradict St. Mat- "thew, that Porphyry, Julian, and such others, might not "take occasion thence to ridicule the Gospel," as Mr. Fabricius[n], who follows Grotius, well observes, and adds, that it is a case like what happened to those words (Mar. xiii. 32.) οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς, *neither the Son*, that they might the better evade the force of the Arian objections.

CHAP. X.

The scripture accounts of St. Luke. The accounts of him from antiquity, viz. that he was born at Antioch. Arguments to prove that he was not a Jew. He was a physician. Of his painting. He was one of Christ's seventy disciples. An objection to this answered. St. Luke was St. Paul's companion and assistant. Was acquainted with several of the apostles. Concerning his death.

IN treating of this Gospel, I shall endeavour to proceed in the same method as in the preceding Gospel; viz. *first to give some account of the author, and then of his Gospel.*

As to St. Luke, the author of this Gospel, I shall distinctly consider,

I. What is said of him in the writings of the New Testament.

II. What is related concerning him in the ancient writings of the Christians, which is credible.

I. *As to what is said of St. Luke the evangelist in the writings of the New Testament.* The name is mentioned, Col. iv. 14. *Luke the beloved physician and Demas greet you.* 2 Tim. iv. 11. *Only Luke is with me.* Philem. 24. *Marcus, Aristar-*

[m] Annot. in Mar. xvi. 1. [n] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Testam. pars 1. p. 327.

chus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers. Concerning which places I observe, that it has been generally supposed by ancient and modern writers, that Luke the evangelist, or author of the Gospel, *is the person meant in each of those places.* Erasmus [o] indeed, and after him Calvin [p], suppose *another person meant,* Col. iv. 14. *by Luke the beloved physician.* The whole foundation of their opinion is, that it would have been needless for Paul to have given him the distinguishing character of a physician, he being a person more known than to need such a mark of distinction; and that it is much more reasonable to suppose St. Paul would have called him here, as he does elsewhere, his companion, or fellow-labourer. But to this it may be answered,

1. That there was no reason why St. Paul should not give him this title, if it belonged to him.

2. That it is certain Luke the evangelist was now with St. Paul at Rome, when he wrote this Epistle from thence to the Colossians.

3. That he is named together with Demas in this place, as well as the others, about which there is no dispute.

4. That he is generally said to have been a physician in the ancient writings.

Although there are no other places in the New Testament, in which we meet with the name of Luke, yet there are two places in which it has been thought that St. Paul referred to him, viz.

(1.) That, Rom. xvi. 21. *Timotheus, my work-fellow, and Lucius, and Jason, and Sosipater, my kinsmen, salute you.* Some of the ancients (as Origen [q] saith) "thought this Lucius "to be Luke the evangelist, who wrote the Gospel; and that "his name received this little alteration according to the pecu- "liar idiom of the country." Sixtus Senensis seems to have been of the same opinion [r]; but this opinion seems evidently precarious, it being unaccountable that Paul should call the same person by two such different names.

[o] Annot. in Col. iv. 14.

[p] In eund. loc.

[q] In Epist. ad Rom. xvi. 21. tom. 3. fol. 223. Sed et Lucium perhibent quidam esse Lucam, qui evangelium scripsit, pro eo quod soleant nomina interdum secundum patriam declinationem, interdum etiam secundum Græcam Romanamque proferri.

[r] Bibl. Sanct. lib. 1. in Luc.

(2.) The person intended by St. Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 18. in those words, *We have sent—the brother, whose praise is in the Gospel, throughout all the churches,* is supposed by most of the ancient and modern writers to have been Luke the evangelist. So Origen[s], Jerome[t], and the interpolator of the Epistles of Ignatius[u], among the ancients; Sixtus Senensis[x], Grotius[y], Dr. Hammond[z], Dr. Cave[a], Dr. Whitby[b], and many others; although Chrysostom, and some of the ancients, followed herein by Calvin[c], and others, suppose that Barnabas was the person meant; and Dr. Lightfoot endeavours largely to prove it was neither, but Mark the evangelist[d].

II. *The credible accounts which we have from antiquity, concerning this evangelist,* are very short and imperfect. I have collected what has fallen within my observation, under the following heads.

1. Many of the ancients tell us, *that St. Luke was born at Antioch in Syria.* So Eusebius[e]; "He was of a family of "Antioch." Jerome[f]; "He was a physician of Antioch." Dorotheus Tyrius[g], and Theophylact[h], &c. say the same. This tradition is so much the more probable, as it is certain that St. Luke was not a Jew; and this appears to me certain,

(1.) Because St. Luke, in his history of the Acts of the Apostles, (ch. i. 19.) speaking of the field, which was purchased with the money for which Judas sold our Saviour, says, *it was called* Aceldama ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν: i. e. *in* THEIR *own language;* which plainly intimates, that the Syriac, or Syro-Chaldaic, i. e. the peculiar dialect of the Jews, was not HIS language.

(2.) Because St. Paul distinguishes him from those who were of the circumcision, Col. iv. 10, 11. compared with 14. He saith, that Marcus, Aristarchus, and Jesus called Justus, were *the only fellow-labourers of the circumcision who were with him;*

[s] Præfat. in Luc.
[t] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luc. Epist. ad Paulin. et Præf. in Com. in Matth.
[u] Epist. ad Ephes. §. 15.
[x] Loc. jam cit.
[y] Annot. in 2 Cor. viii. 18.
[z] Paraphr. ejusdem loci.
[a] Life of St. Luke, §. 2. p. 223.
[b] In 2 Cor. viii. 18.
[c] In eund. loc.
[d] Harmon. of the New Test. year 56.
[e] Λουκᾶς δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος ὢν τῶν ἀπ' Ἀντιοχείας. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 4.
[f] Catalog. Viror. Illustr. in Luca, et Præfat. in Comment. ad Matth.
[g] In Synops.
[h] Præfat. in Luc.

yet it is plain that Epaphras, Demas, and Luke, were *fellow-labourers, that were then with him;* wherefore these were not of the circumcision.

(3.) It was an observation among the ancients, as it has been among many more modern writers, *that St. Luke's Gospel and Acts are written in very pure and elegant Greek.* "He was "well acquainted with the Greek language, as appears by his "writings," says Jerome [i]; and in another place [k] he tells us, that "he was more skilful in the Greek language than any of "the evangelists, and would rather forbear translating a He-"brew word, than do it in Greek which was not pure and ele-"gant." Isidorus Hispalensis styles him "learned in the "Greek tongue [l];" and among the moderns, to omit all others, Dr. Cave [m] has expressed the common opinion of learned men thus; "He all along expresses himself in a vein of purer "Greek, than is to be found in the other writers of the holy "story. Indeed, being born and bred at Antioch, (than which "no place more famous for oratory and eloquence,) he could "not but carry away a great share of the native genius of that "place, though his style is sometimes allayed with a tang of "the Syriac and Hebrew dialect." All this proves St. Luke not to have been a Jew; and accordingly it was a commonly received tradition in the fifth or sixth century, that he was a proselyte to the Jewish religion, and ignorant of the Hebrew language, which (if we will credit Theophylact [n]) he afterwards went to Jerusalem to learn.

2. It is constantly affirmed by the ancients, that *St. Luke the evangelist was a physician.* So we read in the places above cited of Eusebius, Jerome, Dorotheus Tyrius, Isidorus Hispalensis, and many others; and I have above observed, that he seems to be the person whom Paul, Col. iv. 14. calls *the beloved physician.* This (as Dr. Cave well observes [o]) does by no means prove the dignity of his birth and fortune; this art being in those days generally managed by servants. Upon which account, Grotius [p] supposes Luke to have been brought a servant from Antioch to Rome, and there to have practised

[i] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luca.
[k] Epist. ad Damas.
[l] De Vit. et Obit. Sanctor. lib. 1. p. 599. Orthodoxogr. vol. 1.
[m] Life of St. Luke, §. 5.
[n] Præfat. in Luc.
[o] Life of St. Luke, §. 1.
[p] Annot. in Luc. 1.

physic. Concerning his skill in painting, and the several pictures which he drew of the Virgin Mary, so much talked of by the papists, I shall say nothing, all this appearing to be the fiction of later ages. The first time I find any mention of it is in the beginning of the sixth century, when Theodore Lector tells us [q], that Eudocia, the wife of the emperor Theodosius Junior, sent from her exile at Jerusalem (about the year of Christ 448) the image, or picture of the Virgin to Pulcheria, the emperor's sister, which was painted by Luke the apostle. The papists tell us of several of these at Rome and Constantinople, and surprising miracles wrought by them. See Mons. Durant de Ritibus Eccles. Cathol. lib. 1. c. 5. p. 35.

3. It is probable *St. Luke was one of those seventy disciples which our Saviour sent forth;* Luke x. 1, &c. This is asserted by several of the primitive writers; so Origen [r], Epiphanius [s], Hippolytus [t], &c. and should not, I think, without some cogent reasons to the contrary, be rejected as false. I know indeed that Dr. Cave [u], Du Pin [x], and others, have opposed the tradition; because, in the beginning of his Gospel, he says, he wrote not what he was an eyewitness of, and had seen, but that which he had learned from others. But to this I would reply;

That if we suppose St. Luke to have been one of the seventy disciples, it does not thence follow that he must needs be acquainted with, and have personally seen all which he wrote concerning Christ. But on the contrary, the very supposition excludes him from a great deal of personal knowledge of Christ's actions, partly as the seventy were not chosen by Christ till the last year of his ministry, and partly as their being sent abroad necessarily prevented their personal knowledge of what Christ and his disciples did, during that space. St. Luke, therefore, might have been one of the seventy disciples of Christ, though he was not so long or so much with Christ, as to be able to write a history of Christ's life and ac-

[q] Collectan. lib. 1. ipso initio.

[r] Dialog. de Recta Fide. "That dialogue has been questioned; and though Wetstenius contends for its genuineness, yet, I think, it is generally agreed not to belong to Origen." *Cave's Hist. Liter.* vol. 1. p. 84.

[s] Hæres. 51. §. 11.

[t] MS. in Bibl. Bodleian. apud Mill. Præf. in Luc.

[u] Life of Luke, §. 2.

[x] Hist. of Can. of New Test. ch. 2. §. 5.

tions from his own personal knowledge. This seems to me a much better solution of the difficulty, than that which Dr. Whitby has attempted, vainly endeavouring to prove, that *St. Luke's preface shews him to have been an eyewitness of all that he wrote*, than which nothing can be more repugnant to the plain construction of the words[y].

4. *St. Luke was for a long time the constant companion of St. Paul in his travels, and his assistant in the work of the ministry.* This is proved both from the New Testament and the fathers. In the Acts of the Apostles, (xvi. 10, &c.) which book at present I shall take for granted was written by Luke, we find him accompanying St. Paul in his voyage from Troas to Macedonia; for he speaks there in the first person plural, *Immediately* we *endeavoured to go into Macedonia;* and ver. 11. *Therefore loosing from Troas*, we *came with a strait course*, &c. and ver. 13. *On the sabbath* we *went out of the city, and* we *sat down, and* we *spake to the women.* See ver. 16, 17, &c. The twentieth and twenty-first chapters tell us of Luke's accompanying Paul to Jerusalem, as the twenty-seventh does of his going along with him to Rome; and accordingly St. Paul in several of his Epistles, written from Rome, mentions St. Luke as being with him there. See the places above. Nothing is more commonly affirmed by the ancients; as Irenæus[z], Eusebius[a], Jerome[b], Isidorus Hispalensis[c], &c. nor has it, that I know of, ever been questioned.

5. *St. Luke was acquainted with several of the apostles.* This indeed seems necessarily to follow, from his having been one of the seventy disciples, and the companion of St. Paul at Jerusalem, and so many other places. Eusebius expressly tells us[d], "that he lived a long time with Paul, and was intimately "acquainted with the rest of the apostles." The same we find also in Dorotheus Tyrius[e].

6. Epiphanius says, that he preached the Gospel in Dalmatia, France, Italy, and Macedonia[f].

7. Concerning his death there is scarce any thing certain.

[y] Præf. on Luke.
[z] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 14.
[a] Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 4.
[b] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luc.
[c] De Vit. et Obit. Sanctor. inter Orthodoxograph. vol. 1. p. 599.
[d] Loc. jam cit. Τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὡμιληκώς.
[e] In Synops.
[f] Hæres. 51. §. 11.

Jerome[g] tells us, "that he lived eighty-four years, never mar-"ried, was buried at Constantinople, being brought thither" (viz. his bones and relics, together with those of the apostle Andrew) "in the twentieth year of Constantius, from Achaia." Dorotheus says[h], "he died and was buried at Ephesus, and "that his relics were brought, with those of Timothy and An-"drew, to Constantinople, in the time of Constantius." Isidorus Hispalensis[i] also relates the account of *his bones being translated to Constantinople*, but will have it to have been in the time of Constantine, not Constantius; and that he died in the seventy-fourth year of his age, and was buried in Bithynia. Aldhelmus[k], an abbot of Malmsbury, in the year 680, tells us likewise that he lived to the age of seventy-four, and then died in an unmarried state, and that Constantine brought his bones to Constantinople. Concerning the manner of his death I have met with nothing, but that Nicephorus relates[l] his being hanged upon an olive-tree in Greece; and Hippolytus[m], that according to some, he was burnt, according to others, was crucified upon an olive-tree. Some later disputes about St. Luke's body among the papists, see in Spanheim. Histor. Christ. Secul. 15. p. 1336. Hitherto concerning St. Luke.

CHAP. XI.

Of St. Luke's Gospel. It was wrote from the information of the apostles, and other eyewitnesses of Christ's actions. Also under the direction and approbation of St. Paul. The design of it to confute the apocryphal Gospels. An inquiry into the time of its being written.

I PROCEED now to give *some account of that Gospel* which we have under the name of St. Luke. Concerning which, I observe,

1. *That the evangelist wrote it from the informations and relations of those who were eyewitnesses of the things which*

[g] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luca.
[h] In Synops.
[i] De Vit. et Obit. Sanctor. inter Orthodoxograph. vol. 1. p. 599.
[k] De Laudib. Virginit. inter Orthodoxograph. vol. 2. p. 1690.
[l] Lib. 2. c. 43. and Dr. Cave's Life of St. Luke, §. 3.
[m] MS. in Bibl. Bodleian. apud Mill. Procem. in Luc.

it contains. For though we cannot yet take his own testimony in the matter, (who ch. i. 2. saith, *he wrote the things which were delivered unto him by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word,*) yet there is so much other evidence of the truth of the fact, that it cannot with any reason be disputed. Irenæus [n] saith, "that Luke has delivered "to us what the apostles delivered to him." This Tertullian calls *authenticam parraturam* [o]; i. e. "authentic intelligence, or "sufficient and credible informations, out of which he compiled "his Gospel." Eusebius [p] testifies, "that he conversed inti- "mately with the apostles, and that he left the doctrines of "curing souls, which he learned from them, in two divinely "inspired volumes." To the same purpose with all these, Jerome saith, "that Luke wrote not only what he learned from "Paul, but the other apostles [q]." This tradition receives no small confirmation from St. Luke's having been one of the seventy disciples, and so much with St. Paul at Jerusalem, and elsewhere, that it cannot without manifest absurdity be supposed that he knew none of the apostles, or learnt nothing from them.

2. It is probable that *St. Luke's Gospel was wrote under the direction, and published with the approbation of St. Paul.* Thus much at least seems evident from the testimonies of Irenæus [r], who carries the matter so far as to assert, "that Luke com- "posed his Gospel out of what Paul preached;" of Tertullian, who adds [s], "that St. Luke's Gospel was ascribed to Paul as "its author, for those things may seem to be the master's, "which the disciples have published." How much this was the opinion of the ancients will further appear from this notion, which seems to have been common among them, that when Paul in any of his Epistles uses the words MY GOSPEL, (as he does Rom. ii. 16. 2 Tim. ii. 8.) he particularly meant this Gospel of Luke. This was thought by several before Eu-

[n] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 14. Ea quæ ab iis didicerat, tradidit nobis.

[o] Adv. Marcion. lib. 4. c. 2.

[p] Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 4.

[q] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luca. Non solum a Paulo didicisse evangelium— sed a cæteris apostolis.

[r] Καὶ Λουκᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀκόλουθος Παύλου τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 1. Græc. vid. ap. Eus. H. E. lib. 5. c. 8.

[s] Nam et Lucæ digestum Paulo adscribere solent. Adv. Marcion. lib. 4. c. 5.

sebius[t] and Jerome[u]; and though Mr. Fabricius[x] will not believe it to be so, yet it shews us clearly that it was the common opinion of those times, that St. Paul was concerned in publishing this Gospel of St. Luke; to which I conceive also, that of Origen is to be referred, where he saith, that the Gospel of Luke was ὑπὸ Παυλοῦ ἐπαινούμενον, i. e. "commended, or cited "by Paul[y]." But how much soever St. Paul was concerned in approving or directing the publication of this Gospel, it is certainly a mistake in Irenæus, and those who have followed him, to suppose St. Luke wrote only what he heard Paul preach, because himself saith, and I have above proved, that he wrote what those who were eyewitnesses delivered to him, of which number St. Paul was not. I therefore chose rather to lay it down in my proposition, that St. Paul approved or directed the publishing of this Gospel, than that he dictated it.

3. *The particular view or design which St. Luke had* in this Gospel, seems to have been, *to confute the many silly apocryphal Gospels which were then extant, and to prevent the bad influence of them, and their heretical doctrines, upon the Christian converts.* This is what is so manifest from the first words of the Gospel, and the universal voice of antiquity, that I need say no more, only shall refer the reader to the first volume, Part I. Ch. II. p. 21. and the places there cited. Besides this, which is allowed by all as the principal occasion of St. Luke's writing his Gospel, there have been other more particular reasons guessed at by learned men. The two French critics, Father Simon[z] and Du Pin[a], conjecture, that he wrote it *at the desire of Theophilus*, to whom he dedicates it; Dr. Grabe[b] and Dr. Mill[c] suppose *that St. Luke wrote it in Egypt, and with a particular design to confute the Gospel of the Egyptians*, (of which above, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XVI. &c.) but as the first of these seems but little to agree with the received notions of inspiration, so the latter seems very improbable, because we not only want any good evidence of St.

[t] Loc. jam cit.
[u] Ibid.
[x] Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. tom. 1. p. 372, &c.
[y] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.
[z] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 12.
[a] Hist. of the Canon of the New Test. vol. 2. c. 2. §. 5.
[b] Spicileg. Patr. Sæcul. 1. p. 33, 34.
[c] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 114.

Luke's having ever been in Egypt, but because we find none of those, which we know to have been the peculiar doctrines of the Egyptian Gospel, so much as once referred to in this of St. Luke.

4. *The time or period in which this Gospel was wrote is very uncertain*, there being not (as far as I know) any monuments of antiquity, by which it can be fixed or determined. The ancients generally place the writing of this Gospel after those two of St. Matthew and St. Mark. In this order I find them ranged by Origen [d], Eusebius [e], Jerome [f], and many other writers of those times; from whence it is plain, they were bound together in their volumes in the order which they are now; this, I think, can be no better way accounted for, than by supposing, that they did imagine them written in the same order; and accordingly they are placed in all the old manuscripts, of which I have met with any account [g], except in that very ancient manuscript of Beza, now called the Cambridge Manuscript, being given by Beza to that university. In this manuscript, the order stands thus [h]; Matthew is placed first, then John, after him Luke, then Mark. It is certain, this was not the order in which the evangelists wrote; and it is very probable the writer of this manuscript intended to place first those of the evangelists who were apostles, viz. Matthew and John, and then those who were not, Luke and Mark; supposing perhaps, that as John wrote after Matthew, so Mark did after Luke. But according to the general opinion of the ancients, Luke wrote after Mark; the particular time they have not determined. According to several old manuscripts, St. Luke wrote his Gospel fifteen years after the ascension of Christ [i], viz. about the year 49, but this must certainly be a mistake; for if he wrote after Mark, he must write after the year of Christ 63; i. e. above thirty years after our Saviour's ascension; for I have above proved, that Mark did not write till after that time. Jerome informs us, that St. Luke wrote in the regions of Achaia and

[d] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.

[e] Lib. 3. c. 24.

[f] Præf. in Comment. in Matth.

[g] See Father Simon's Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 10.

[h] Vid. Bez. in Titul. Marc.

[i] See Father Simon in the place now cited, and the same asserted, as to several other manuscripts, in Dr. Mill on the last verse of Luke.

Bithynia[k]; and as his words are commonly understood by Grotius[l], Dr. Cave[m], Father Simon[n], and others, that he wrote it when he accompanied St. Paul into those parts. If this be true, it was wrote about the year of Christ 52 or 53; but this is upon many accounts improbable; for, upon a close observation of Jerome's words, I find they have hitherto been quite misunderstood; and it is evident,

1. That Jerome does not say that Luke wrote his Gospel, while he was with Paul in Achaia and Bithynia; he only asserts, according to the common punctuation of the words, that he was a disciple of Paul, and composed his Gospel in Achaia and Bithynia; *Lucas—discipulus apostoli Pauli, in Achaiæ Bithyniæque* (other copies read *Bœotiæque*) *partibus volumen condidit.*

2. The present punctuation of Jerome's words seems not to be right; for the comma, or distinction, ought rather to be put after the word *partibus*, than after the word *Pauli;* so that the sense or construction seems rather to be, that Luke was the disciple of Paul in Achaia and Bithynia, and [afterwards] wrote his Gospel; than that he was the disciple of Paul, and wrote his Gospel in Achaia and Bithynia.

For any thing therefore which has been yet said to the contrary, it seems most probable that St. Luke wrote his Gospel after St. Mark's, i. e. after the year of Christ 63: and as it is very likely that he wrote it not long before the Acts of the Apostles, which must needs be written after the year of Christ 62, so it is probable he wrote them both at Rome after Paul's departure thence; for that he continued at Rome after Paul, at least that he did not go away along with him is evident, because his history ends at that period. There is indeed a passage, which I have observed in the old book of Hypotyposes, under the name of Clemens Alexandrinus, cited by Eusebius, (Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. c. 14.) wherein it is asserted that St. Luke's Gospel was written before St. Mark's, viz. προγεγράφθαι ἔλεγεν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τὰ περιέχοντα τὰς γενεαλογίας: viz. "That those "of the Gospels were written first, which contain our Saviour's

[k] Præf. in Comment. in Matth.
[l] Annot. in Titul. Luc.
[m] Life of St. Luke, §. 4.
[n] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 12. p. 102.

"genealogies;" but this book of the Hypotyposes not being wrote by Clemens, but the composure of some silly heretic, (as I have proved, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XXXVI. p. 326.) I think it needless to regard the testimony.

CHAP. XII.

St. Luke's Gospel is canonical. It is in the ancient catalogues, cited by the primitive fathers, read in the churches, and put in the Syriac version.

Arg. I. ST. LUKE'S Gospel is to be esteemed of canonical authority, by Prop. IV. because *it is in all the catalogues of canonical books, which we have among the writings of the primitive Christians.* These catalogues I have collected, Vol. I. Part I. Ch. VIII. and referred to, in proving the authority of Matthew and Mark's Gospels above, viz. the catalogue of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, that in the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Ruffin, Austin, that in the third council of Carthage, and in the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. To which I add, the general proof I have above made in this Part, (Dissert. Præf.) that the four Gospels which we now receive were received by the primitive Christians.

Arg. II. The Gospel of St. Luke is canonical, because *it is cited as scripture in the writings of the primitive Christians*, Prop. V. I intend here, as in the former Gospels, to shew the several authors who have cited, and the places wherein they have cited this Gospel, and shall begin with,

I. ST. PAUL.

It has been supposed by many of the ancients, (as I have observed above, Ch. XI.) that as often as St. Paul uses the words MY GOSPEL, he cites and refers to St. Luke (see Rom. ii. 16. 2 Tim. ii. 8.). So many of the Christians before the time of Eusebius [o] and Jerome [p] thought, and Origen expressly calls it the Gospel ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐπαινούμενον, i. e. "commended or cited "by Paul [q];" but I confess, though I have mentioned this, it

[o] Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 4.
[p] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Luca.
[q] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 25.

is not because I believe St. Paul did cite this Gospel, (it being wrote, in my opinion, some years after the Epistle to the Romans, though perhaps not after that to Timothy,) but because it gives us clear intimation, how highly esteemed this Gospel was in the most ancient times of Christianity, being judged worthy by them to be cited by St. Paul, and called his own Gospel.

II. Clemens Romanus.

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	*The first Epistle of* Clemens Romanus *to the Corinthians.*
1 Ch. vi. 36—39.	1 Chap. xiii. Several sayings of our Lord are here referred to; some of which are in St. Matthew (as above said) and some in St. Luke.
2 Ch. xvii. 1, 2.	2 Chap. xlvi. Cotelerius has observed upon this place, that Clemens not only cites Matthew, but Luke; and indeed the order of his words is more agreeable to this last.
	The second Epistle of Clemens Romanus *to the Corinthians.*
3 Ch. xiii. 27.	3 Ch. iv. This seems to be rather taken out of Luke than Matthew, because of the words πόθεν ἐστὲ, which are in Luke, and not in Matthew.
4 Ch. xvi. 26.	4 Ch. vi. It seems to be taken out of Luke, because the words are the same.
5 Ch. xvi. 10, 12.	5 Ch. viii. See the Appendix to Vol. I. p. 362.

III. Ignatius.

That he has cited Luke xxiv. 39. in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, chap. 3. I have proved above, Vol. I. Part II. Chap. XXVII. p. 258.

IV. Justin Martyr.

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	Justin Martyr's *Works.*
1 Ch. i. 17.	1 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 268.
2 —— 32.	2 Apolog. 2. pro Christ. p. 75.
3 —— 35, 38.	3 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 327.
4 Ch. ii. 2.	4 Apolog. 2. pro Christ. p. 75.
5 Ch. x. 19.	5 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 301, 302.
6 —— 22.	6 ——— p. 95, 96, 326.
7 Ch. xiii. 26, 27.	7 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 301.
8 Ch. xxii. 44.	8 ——— p. 331.
9 Ch. xxiii. 46.	9 ——— p. 333.

V. Irenæus.

St. Luke's Gospel is so frequently cited by this father, that it would be superfluous to collect the citations; besides Feuardentius has with so much exactness collected them at the end of his edition of Irenæus, that it will be sufficient to refer the reader to his index. I shall only observe,

1. That there are *above a hundred citations* of this Gospel made by Irenæus in his works.

2. That (lib. 3. adv. Hæres. c. 14.) *he vindicates the authority and perfection of St. Luke's Gospel*, and has made there a collection of many or most of the histories which this evangelist has recorded, which are not mentioned by either of the other, and says, "the histories of Christ, which St. Luke alone "has recorded, were received by all Christians[r]."

3. That he in very many places cites this Gospel by the name of *Luke*, which the reader may see in the following instances.

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	Irenæus.
1 Luke iii. 23.	1 Lib. 2. c. 39.
2 —— iii. 4.	2 Lib. 3. c. 9.
3 —— i. 6, 8, 9, 15, 17, and a great part of that chapter.	3 —— c. 11.

[r] Et plurimos actus Domini per hunc (sc. Lucam) didicimus, quibus et omnes utuntur.

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	Irenæus.
4 Many places of this Gospel.	4 Lib. 3. c. 14.
5 —— iii. 24, &c.	5 —— c. 33.
6 —— iv. 5, 6.	6 Lib. 5. c. 21.

Many other such instances might easily be collected; but I suppose these, with what has been said above, (*Dissert. præfix.*) may be sufficient to evidence to any one the sentiments which Irenæus had of this Gospel.

VI. Clemens Alexandrinus.

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
1 Ch. iii. 12, 13, 14.	1 Pædagog. lib. 3. p. 261.
2 Ch. vi. 36.	2 Stromat. lib. 2. p. 404.
3 —— 46.	3 ——— lib. 7. p. 766.
4 Ch. xii. 19.	4 Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 210.
5 ——— 20.	5 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 487.
6 ——— 36, 37.	6 Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 185.
7 Ch. xiv. 8, 13, 16, &c.	7 ——— p. 141.
8 ——— 20.	8 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 465.
9 ——— 26.	9 ——— p. 467.
10 Ch. xv. 1, &c.	10 Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 144.
11 ——— 7.	11 Stromat. lib. 2. p. 390.
12 Ch. xvi. 19, &c. viz. the parable of the rich man and Lazarus.	12 This is referred to several times by Clemens, viz. Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 199. lib. 3. p. 234. et Stromat. lib. 4. p. 486.
13 Ch. xviii. 8.	13 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 447.
14 Ch. xix. 8.	14 ——— lib. 4. p. 488.
15 Ch. xxii. 31.	15 ——— p. 503.
16 Ch. xxiv. 41.	16 Pædagog. lib. 2. p. 148. In this last place Clemens has cited Luke by name.

Besides these references to St. Luke, made by Clemens in his *Pædagogus* and *Stromata*, I have met with several others in that small tract of his, entitled, *Quis Dives Salvetur?* These are as follow:

St. Luke's *Gospel.*	*The Treatise of* Clemens Alexandrinus, *entitled,* Quis Dives Salvetur?
1 Ch. v. 29.	1 Cap. xiii. p. 34.
2 Ch. vi. 30.	2 Cap. xxxi. p. 86.
3 Ch. x. 29—37.	3 Cap. xxviii. p. 77.
4 Ch. xii. 32.	4 Cap. xxxi. p. 82.
5 Ch. xiv. 26.	5 Cap. xxii. p. 61.
6 Ch. xv. 9, 10.	6 Cap. xxxix. p. 102.
7 Ch. xvi. 9.	7 Cap. xiii. p. 34.
8 Ch. xix. 5.	8 Ibid.

The citations out of this Gospel in the works of Tertullian, Origen, Cyril, Cyprian, Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, &c. are so very numerous, and so easy to be observed every where in their writings, that I shall omit making any collections out of them. These, as the preceding fathers, appeal always to this Gospel as scripture; and no wonder they should, when they were assured it was, as Eusebius calls it, Θεόπνευστον βιβλίον, "an in-"spired book." Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 4.

Arg. III. The Gospel of St. Luke is canonical, because *it was read as scripture in the churches or assemblies of the primitive Christians,* by Prop. VI. For the proof of the fact I must refer the reader to Part I. Ch. X. of this work, and what I have above said, Ch. III. in this Part, concerning the reading of St. Matthew's Gospel.

Arg. IV. St. Luke's Gospel is canonical, because *it was esteemed as such by the churches of Syria in or near the apostles' time;* and accordingly by them in those days translated, and inserted in their collection of sacred books, Prop. XV.

Thus much concerning the canonical authority of this Gospel; nor have I any further to add, but that as Marcion and his heretical followers had a different Gospel of St. Luke, from that which we now receive, so these differences were all owing to the impudence of Marcion, who inserted and left out what he thought convenient to serve his own purposes; which has largely been proved by Irenæus[s], Tertullian[t], and Epipha-

[s] Advers. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 11, 12.

[t] Adv. Marcion. lib. 4. c. 3, &c.

nius [u], to whom I must refer the reader; and among later writers to Sixtus Senensis [x], Father Simon [y], Du Pin [z], and Dr. Mill [a].

CHAP. XIII.

A collection of all that is said of St. John in the New Testament. The history of his life from the ancients. He settled in Asia Minor. Suffered under Domitian. Was banished to Patmos. Returned to Ephesus. A story of him and Cerinthus. Another of him and a young man. He raised the dead, &c. When and how he died. John xxi. 21. *misunderstood by many of the ancients, who imagined thence, that he never died.*

FOR the clearer establishment of the canonical authority of this Gospel, it will be requisite that here, as in the former Gospels, I should first give some account of *the author*, and then of *his work*.

Concerning the author we have *some accounts in scripture*, and some which are credible *in the primitive Christian writings*. Each shall be distinctly considered.

I. The accounts which we have of St. John the evangelist *in the writings of the New Testament* are as follow; viz.

1. His *father's name* was Zebedee, a fisherman by trade, and his mother's Salome [b].

2. He was *born in Galilee*, as is probable, because there Christ found him, and called him [c] with his brother James.

3. He was constituted one of Christ's *first apostles*, and sent out with the twelve [d].

4. He seems to have been of a *very warm and zealous temper*. This I gather; (1.) Because he is entitled by Christ, with his brother James, *Boanerges* [e], i. e. *son of thunder*. (2.) Be-

[u] Hæres. 42.
[x] Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 7. de Luc. Evang.
[y] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 12.
[z] Histor. of the Canon, vol. 2. c. 2. §. 5.
[a] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 306—328.
[b] Matt. iv. 21. xxvii. 56. compared with Mark xv. 40.
[c] Matt. iv. 21.
[d] Matt. x. 2.
[e] Mar. iii. 17.

cause he was for *forbidding a certain person any more to cast out devils in Christ's name*, because HE did not follow them[f]. (3.) Because he with his brother James *desired to call down fire* (i. e. thunder or lightning) *from heaven, to consume the Samaritans*[g]. (4.) Because after Christ's ascension, we find John with Peter was *the chief speaker and actor in the defence and propagation of the Gospel at Jerusalem*[h].

5. He received *several particular instances and marks of our Saviour's favour, above most or all the apostles.* Hence he has often the character given him of *that disciple whom Jesus loved*[i]; and particular evidences hereof seem to be, (1.) That he *was admitted* with Peter and James *to be present at our Saviour's transfiguration*[k]. (2.) That *he was sent* with Peter *to prepare the last passover* for our Saviour[l]. (3.) He was *placed in the most honourable seat at the supper;* he leaned on Jesus's bosom, or lay on his breast[m]; i. e. he sat in the next place to Christ; and as it was the custom of those countries then, to lie along on couches at meals, his head lay in the bosom of Christ, who sat before him; (4.) *When Peter durst not himself, he desired John to ask Christ*, who should betray him; *which he did, and received an answer*[n]. (5.) *He alone, with his brother James and Peter, was admitted to the favour of our Lord's discourse and devotion in the mount of Olives*[o]. (6.) *Christ upon the cross appointed him the guardian of his mother, the Virgin Mary*, giving her instructions to own him as a son, and him to own her as a mother[p]: John accordingly took her to his home. (7.) *He was first favoured by Christ with the discovery of himself to him, at the sea of Tiberias, after his resurrection*[q]. (8.) The answer which Christ gave to Peter, relating to John, seems not a little to his honour, *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee*[r]?

Besides the above mentioned, we have the following particulars concerning him; as (1.) That he with his brother James petitioned Christ to be advanced to high posts in his [temporal]

[f] Mar. ix. 38. and Luke ix. 49.
[g] Luke ix. 54.
[h] Acts iii. 1, &c.
[i] John xiii. 23. xix. 26. xx. 2. xxi. 20.
[k] Matt. xvii. 1, &c. Luke ix. 28.
[l] Luke xxii. 8.
[m] John xiii. 23, 25.
[n] John xiii. 23—26.
[o] Matt. xxvi. 36. and Luke xxii. 39.
[p] John xix. 16, 17.
[q] John xxi. 7.
[r] John xxi. 23.

kingdom[s]: and though Matthew says, their mother presented the petition for them[t]; yet seeing Mark so positively asserts their presenting it themselves, and both Matthew and Mark agree that our Saviour directed his answer to the sons, and not the mother, there can be no room to doubt but they were concerned therein. (2.) He was known to the high priest, attended our Saviour's trial, and procured introduction for Peter into the hall[u]. Though John be not named there, yet being spoke of as usual in the third person, and it being certain that he afterwards attended Christ at his crucifixion[x], which we do not know that any other apostle did, it is more than probable he was the person there intended. (3.) He ran with Peter to Christ's sepulchre, on the first account of his resurrection[y]. (4.) After Christ's ascension he preached with Peter in the temple, and healed the lame man, preached to the people[z], was apprehended of the Sadducees[a], imprisoned, and boldly pleaded in defence of Christianity[b]. (5.) He was the deputy of the apostles with Peter to go to Samaria, to confirm and enlarge the churches which were planted there[c]. And besides this I find nothing related concerning him in the New Testament, except his being the author of three Epistles and the Revelation; of which in their proper places. There are indeed two other places of the Gospel, in which John is supposed to be the person referred to, viz. that, John i. 35—40. where mention is made of two of John the Baptist's disciples who went to Christ; the one is said to be Andrew, the other not named is supposed to be John our evangelist, because he particularly relates all the circumstances of the history, and conceals his own name[d]; but this is by no means a sufficient reason, especially considering that John seems not to have known Christ till he was called, Matt. iv. 21. The other place is that, Mark xiv. 51, 52. where we read of a young man that followed Christ, when he was apprehended, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body, which he left in the hands of those who laid hold on

[s] Mark x. 35.
[t] Matt. xx. 20.
[u] John xviii. 16.
[x] John xix. 26.
[y] John xx. 2, &c.
[z] Acts iii. 1, &c.
[a] Acts iv. 1, &c.
[b] Acts iv. per tot.
[c] Acts viii. 14, &c.
[d] Vid. Epiphan. Hæres. 51. §. 14. Dr. Cave's Life of St. John, §. 1. and Dr. Whitby on John i. 40.

him; this is supposed to be John by several of the ancients, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Gregory [e], and Dr. Cave among the moderns [f]; but as there is no evidence offered to support the conjecture, it cannot be unfair to reject it.

II. *The accounts which we have from the ancients concerning St. John are large.* I shall lay down what seems most remarkable.

It is generally agreed by the ancients, that when the apostles determined to go abroad to propagate the Gospel, *St. John had Asia Minor for his province.* This is attested by Polycrates [g], Irenæus [h], Eusebius [i], Dorotheus [k], and many others. I shall only observe, that in the Life of this apostle [l], under the name of Prochorus, (who was one of the seven deacons appointed by the apostles, Acts vi. 5.) it is said, that all the apostles met at Gethsemane after Christ's ascension, and having their several provinces determined by lot, Asia fell to John; which, though he received at first with concern, he afterwards complied with. It is however very probable, that St. John did not till a long time after Christ's ascension enter upon his charge; because, as Dr. Cave [m] well observes, had he been in Asia early, we must needs have heard of him in the accounts which St. Luke gives of St. Paul's several journeys into, and residence in, those parts; it is therefore most likely he stayed for a long time after our Saviour's ascent at Jerusalem. The next thing we read of St. John, is his *being a sufferer in the second general persecution under Domitian at Rome, where he was cast into a caldron of boiling oil, but miraculously preserved, and the fire had no influence upon him.* This is related by Tertullian [n], and by no one else except Jerome, who says he transcribed it

[e] Apud Whitby in Mar. xiv. 51.

[f] Lib. cit. §. 3.

[g] Epist. ad Victorem et Romanæ Urbis Ecclesiam de Paschate, cujus fragmentum extat apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 24.

[h] Advers. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 11.

[i] Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 1.

[k] In Synops.

[l] This book is printed in Greek and Latin among the Orthodoxographa, vol. 1. p. 85. but is justly rejected as spurious by Bellarmine, (de Script. Eccles. in Prochoro,) and many papists, as by all protestant writers. Cocus Censur. quorund. vet. Script. p. 13. Rivet. Critic. Sacr. lib. 1. c. 6. Cave Histor. Liter. p. 23. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. t. 2. p. 817.

[m] Life of St. John, §. 4.

[n] De Præscript. adv. Hæretic. cap. 36. Apostolus Joannes, postea quam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.

from him[o]; and, if it be true[p], happened in the fourteenth year of Domitian, i. e. about the year of Christ 96. So we read expressly in Eusebius's Chronicon and Jerome[q]. After this, the *apostle was by the same emperor banished to a desolate island in the south-east part of the Ægean sea, called Patmos*[r]. So we are informed by Tertullian[s], Eusebius[t], Jerome[u], Severus Sulpitius[x], &c. though Dorotheus Tyrius seems to have believed that this banishment was by Trajan, and not Domitian[y], which is certainly a mistake. In this exile state, it is said St. John was suitably comforted and supported with the *visions and revelations from God*, which he afterwards published; see Irenæus[z], Eusebius[a], Jerome[b], Severus Sulpitius[c], and Austin[d]. The second general persecution ended with Domitian; and times more favourable to Christianity succeeding, St. John had an opportunity to return to his former friends at Ephesus, which, as it was the place of his former abode in Asia, so became now his settlement for life. Here he acted the part of a Christian bishop or minister, and together with seven other bishops presided over that diocese, if we may credit the author of the book entitled Μαρτύριον Τιμοθέου; i. e. *The Martyrdom of Timothy*[e].

The other accounts which I have met with concerning St. John cannot be reduced to any certain order of time: Dr. Cave and Du Pin have collected them already; for which reason I shall but just name them, in the order in which the several authors lived, who have mentioned them.

[o] Lib. 1. contr. Jovin. c. 14. et in Matth. xx. apud Cleric. Hist. Eccles. p. 508.

[p] However good Tertullian's credit may be, yet the story cannot but appear dubious, when we consider that so remarkable a fact fell only within the observation of one single writer.

[q] Catalog. Viror. Illustr. in Joanne.

[r] According to some it was reckoned among the islands called Cyclades, according to others among those called Sporades. Vid. Plin. lib. 4. c. 12. Dionys. Perieges. v. 530. et Gulielm. Hill Not. in loc. p. 134.

[s] De Præscript. adv. Hæretic. c. 36.

[t] Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 18.

[u] Loc. jam cit.

[x] Histor. Sacr. lib. 2. p. 535. inter Orthodoxograph. vol. 1. Grynæus, the editor, instead of Severus Sulpitius, calls him by mistake Sulpitius Severus. See Dr. Cave's Hist. Liter. tom. 1. p. 284.

[y] In Synops.

[z] Advers. Hæres. lib. 5. c. 30.

[a] Loc. jam cit.

[b] Ibid.

[c] Ibid.

[d] Quæst. ex Nov. Test. §. 72.

[e] Apud Phot. Cod. 254. This book goes under the name of Polycrates of Ephesus, a writer of the second century, but is rejected as spurious by Dr. Cave, Hist. Liter. p. 60. and Fabricius Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test. p. 812.

IRENÆUS [f] informs us, there were some in his time who had the following account from Polycarp, who was one of John's disciples, viz. "That St. John going to a certain bath at Ephe-"sus, and perceiving that Cerinthus, that noted arch-heretic, "was in the bath, immediately leaped out without bathing "himself, and said, *Let us go hence, lest the bath should fall* "*down upon us, having in it such an heretic as Cerinthus,* "*that enemy of truth.*" What the heresy of Cerinthus was, may be largely seen in Irenæus [g], Epiphanius [h], and many of the ancients. Some account of his principles is given above, Vol. I. Part II. Ch. XII.

CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS concludes his treatise, entitled, *Quis Dives Salvetur* [i]? with a remarkable history, which most of our ecclesiastical writers have taken notice of. I shall recite it therefore briefly, viz. "That when St. John was returned "from his exile in Patmos to Ephesus, he visited the neigh-"bouring churches, and observing in one of the cities a young "man of an uncommon genius and handsome body, he com-"mended him in the presence of the church to the care of the "bishop [k] of the place, who, taking the charge of him, in-"structed and baptized him; at length giving him his liberty, "he fell into the worst of company, and entered into a strict "alliance with some persons, who were not only in other re-"spects debauched in their morals, but notorious robbers, of "whom he became the captain, and led them in all their acts "of murder, robbery, &c. Some time after St. John's occa-"sions calling him to this city, he inquired after the young "man. The bishop with concern replied, he was dead, mean-"ing he was dead to God, and joined to a band of villains and "robbers. Upon which St. John took a horse and guide, came "to the place where the robbers were, and being seized by "their sentinels, he desired to be brought to their captain, "who, when he saw him, fled through shame; but St. John

[f] Advers. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 3. et in Euseb. lib. 4. c. 14.

[g] Lib. 3. passim.

[h] Hæres. 28.

[i] It was published 1683, at Oxford, by bishop Fell.

[k] I cannot but observe here, that when Clemens delivers the young man to his charge, he calls him ἐπίσκοπος, and a few lines after, when he speaks of the care which he took of him, he calls him πρεσβύτερος· an undeniable demonstration, that *presbyter* and *bishop* were two names of one person in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus.

" pursued him, desiring him not to fly, and promising him par-
" don from Christ, by whom he said he was sent; upon this
" he stayed, and in the greatest distress threw down his arms,
" and embracing the apostle, he groaned, and floods of tears
" poured down from his eyes. Upon which St. John, assuring
" him of pardon, prayed for him, and brought him back to the
" church."

APOLLONIUS, a writer in the second century against the Montanists, tells us[l], that "he raised a dead person to life." This I find no where else related, unless that should be thought to be the same, which I observe in Isidore Hispalensis[m], concerning *his raising a widow from the dead* by the command of the people, or *his restoring and bringing a young man's soul into his body again*, related in the same place.

POLYCRATES, a writer of the same time, makes *St. John to be a priest, and as such to have worn a πέταλον, or plate*[n]. Jerome, citing this of Polycrates, paraphrases it thus[o]; *Pontifex ejus (scil. Christi) fuit, auream laminam in fronte portans;* i. e. "He was high priest of Christ, and wore a golden plate on " his forehead." This is said also of James, bishop of Jerusalem, by Epiphanius[p], who cites Clemens and Eusebius for the truth of it; and, if it be true, is well accounted for by Valesius[q], who supposes those first Christians to have done it in imitation of the Jewish high priests.

TERTULLIAN informs us, that St. John convicted an Asiatic presbyter of forging and publishing the Acts of Paul and Thecla, under the name of Paul[r]. See the place at large above, Vol. II. Part III. Ch. XXXIV. p. 326.

The time, place, and manner of St. John's death, are very differently related by the ancients. Irenæus affirms[s], that "he " continued till the reign of the emperor Trajan;" and elsewhere[t], that "he presided over the church of Ephesus till that " time." Irenæus was followed in this opinion by most of the ancients. Eusebius makes St. John's exit to have been in the

[l] Lib. contr. Cataphryg. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. c. 18.
[m] Loc. supr. cit.
[n] Epist. ad Victor. et Eccles. Roman. apud Euseb. lib. 5. c. 24.
[o] Catalog. Vir. Illustr. in Polycrat.
[p] Hæres. 29. §. 4. et Hæres. 78. §. 14.
[q] Annot. in loc. Euseb. denuo cit.
[r] Lib. de Baptism. c. 17.
[s] Adv. Hæres. lib. 2. c. 39.
[t] Lib. 3. c. 3.

third year of Trajan [u]; and agreeably thereto, Jerome [x] places it in the sixty-eighth year after Christ's death, which coincides with the third year of Trajan, and the hundred and first, or hundred and second year after our Saviour's nativity. That St. John did live till this reign, I find also asserted in the ancient book, of which we have an abstract in Photius [y], which is entitled, the Martyrdom of Timothy, in Isidore Hispalensis's Treatise of the Lives and Deaths of the Prophets and Apostles [z], and in the Synopsis of Dorotheus [a], though he make St. John to have lived to the age of an hundred and twenty; which, if it were certain, would prove that he died not in the beginning, but in the end of Trajan's reign, if not rather in the reign of Adrian [b]. He that would read more of the time of St. John's death may consult Mr. Dodwell [c].

It is impossible to say any thing certain concerning the manner of St. John's death. Polycrates [d] says, he "died a martyr "at Ephesus," as do some other of the ancients, viz. Chrysostom [e] and Theophylact [f], his constant follower. Whether the later writers, who have asserted St. John's martyrdom, were induced to that opinion, only by supposing that those words of Christ, Matt. xx. 23. to John and James, implied their violent death, viz. *Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with*, &c. I shall not determine. To me the fact seems probable, not only from the testimony of Polycrates, but because all the rest of the apostles did suffer martyrdom, and the text seems not obscurely to imply it.

The mistaken judgment of the apostles, that John should never die, founded upon those words of our Saviour, John xxi. 21, &c. *If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?* led many of the ancients also into a persuasion, that St. John did never die. St. Austin [g] has largely discussed the question,

[u] In Chronic. ad ann. 103.
[x] Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Joanne.
[y] Cod. 254.
[z] Inter Orthodoxogr. vol. 1. p. 598.
[a] Edit. Latin.
[b] It being reasonable to suppose John, when he was called to the work of the ministry, was not under the age of Christ, i. e. not under his thirtieth year, none undertaking that office earlier.
[c] Addit. ad Pearson. Dissert. 2. de Success. Rom. Episc. c. 5.
[d] Epist. ad Victor. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 24.
[e] Homil. 66. in Matth.
[f] In Matth. xx. 23.
[g] Tract. 124. in Joann.

and tells us of an opinion of some, founded upon some apocryphal scriptures, viz. That St. John in perfect health ordered his grave to be made, and then laid himself down in it, as in a bed, and died. Others say, he did not then die, but only lay down asleep like a person dead; and in this state of sleep, not death, he will continue till Christ come: that he is not dead, says he, they prove by the motion of the grave dust, which is continually occasioned to boil and bubble by the motion of his breast. This opinion, says St. Austin, I will not oppose; for I have been informed of the fact from grave and credible witnesses. Isidore Hispalensis[h] relates the same story, with several other particular circumstances, too trifling to be mentioned. Ephraim Theopolitanus, bishop of Antioch, about the year of Christ 510[i], endeavours to prove, that St. John never died, but was translated, as Enoch and Elijah. I will add no more, but that the same opinion seems to have been received in the several succeeding ages of Christianity. Georgius Trapezuntius, a learned writer, though late, has wrote five whole treatises, which he dedicates to the pope, with design to prove that St. John never did die. I shall think it sufficient to refer the reader to the ingenious tract[k]. Hence it came to pass, that several impostors have professed themselves to be this apostle; one particularly in the time of Martinus, about the year 400[l], and another in queen Elizabeth's time, who was afterwards burnt at Thoulouse in France, as we are told by Beza[m].

CHAP. XIV.

St. John's Gospel wrote against the heretics, viz. the Cerinthians and Ebionites, who denied our Saviour's divinity; as also to enlarge the Gospel history. It was wrote after the year of Christ 97. *An objection to this answered. Other miscellaneous remarks.*

CONCERNING St. John's Gospel, whatever appears to me considerable, I shall lay down in the following observations.

[h] De Vit. et Obit. Prophet. et Sanctor. inter Orthodox. vol. 1. p. 598.
[i] Respons. ad Anatol. Scholast. Quæst. apud Phot. cod. 229.
[k] Inter Orthodoxogr. vol. 2. p. 1231.
[l] Vid. Sever. Sulpit. de Vita Martin. inter Orthodoxogr. vol. 1. p. 556.
[m] Annot. in Joann. xxi. 21.

I. St. John seems to have had two particular designs in the writing of his Gospel, viz. *the confuting of certain heretics, and supplying the defects of the history of Christ in the other Gospels.*

1. St. John wrote his Gospel with *the intent or design of confuting certain heretics of that early age, who denied the divinity of our Saviour.* This is largely attested by the ancients. Irenæus tells us, "[n] That the evangelist designed by his Gospel "pel to confute the errors which Cerinthus had infused into "the minds of the people, and had been infused by those who "were called Nicolaitans; and to convince them, that there "was one God, who made all things by his WORD, and not, as "they imagined, ONE who was the Creator, and ANOTHER who "was the Father of the Lord [Jesus]; ONE who was the Son "of the Creator, and ANOTHER who was the Christ, who con-"tinued impassible, and descended upon Jesus the Son of the "Creator," &c. Epiphanius proves St. John's Gospel could not be written by Cerinthus, because *it was wrote against him*[o]. Jerome is most particular, and informs us[p], "That "when St. John was in Asia, where then arose the here-"sies of Ebion and Cerinthus, and others, who denied that "Christ was come in the flesh, i. e. denied his divine nature, "whom he in his Epistle calls antichrists, and St. Paul fre-"quently condemns in his Epistles, he was forced by almost "all the bishops of Asia, and the deputations of many other "churches, to write more plainly concerning the divinity of our "Saviour, and to soar aloft in a discourse on the WORD, not "more bold than happy." Whence we are told in ecclesiastical history, that when he was solicited by the brethren to write, he answered, he would not do it, unless a public day of fasting and prayer was appointed to implore God's assistance; which being done, and the solemnity being honoured with a satisfactory revelation from God, he broke forth into those words, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was God,* &c. To the same purpose Austin[q] saith, "this evangelist wrote "concerning the coeternal divinity of Christ against the here-

[n] Adv. Hæres. l. 3. c. 11.
[o] Hæres. 51. §. 4. et 12.
[p] Præfat. in Comment. in Matt. See the same. Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Joann.
[q] Præf. in Tract. in Joann.

"tics;" and the same father has in several places observed, that he above the rest of the apostles has asserted Christ's equality with the Father; and while they are content to give an account of Christ's miracles and moral precepts, he rather chose to relate those things which pertained to our Saviour's divinity[r].

2. St. John wrote his Gospel with intent to *supply the defects of our Saviour's history in the other three Gospels;* for whereas they say little of that part of our Saviour's life, which preceded the imprisonment of *John the Baptist*, he has inserted it in his Gospel. This is related by Eusebius[s], Jerome[t], &c. though the author of the ancient book of Hypotyposes, under the name of Clemens Alexandrinus[u], assigns this reason somewhat differently, viz. John observing that in the other Gospels τὰ σωματικὰ—δεδήλωται, i. e. *The things pertaining to our Lord's human nature were wrote;* he, *inspired by the Holy Ghost*, at the request of his friends, composed πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον, i. e. *a spiritual Gospel*, or *an account of our Saviour's divinity.* To the same purpose we read in Epiphanius[x], that the other Gospels had so fully related the affair of Christ's incarnation, and the things which he did as incarnate, that he judged it needless to write the same, and therefore wrote his Gospel against Ebion, Cerinthus, Marcion, &c. who affirmed, that Christ had no being before he was born of Mary.

II. St. John's Gospel seems to have been written about the year of Christ 98.

The most ancient Christians have fixed no time of its writing. Irenæus only saith, "that it was wrote at Ephesus dur-"ing his abode there[y];" but whether it was before his banish-

[r] Loc. cit. et de Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. 4.

[s] Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 24. See the place at large above in this Part, in the previous Dissertation.

[t] Aliam causam hujus scripturæ ferunt, quod quum legisset Matthæi, Marci, et Lucæ volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiæ, et vera eos dixisse firmaverit, sed unius tantum anni, (*This was a common, but unaccountable mistake of the ancients, that the three other evangelists relate only the history of Christ for one year,*) in quo et passus est, post carcerem Joannis historiam texuisse. Prætermisso itaque anno, cujus acta a tribus exposita fuerant, superioris temporis, antequam Joannes clauderetur in carcerem, gesta narravit. Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Joann.

[u] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.

[x] Hæres. 51. §. 12.

[y] Joannes discipulus Domini edidit evangelium Ephesi Asiæ commorans. Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 1.

ment from thence by Domitian to Patmos, or after, he saith not. It is upon many accounts most probable, that it was written after his return. Epiphanius expressly asserts, "that "he wrote it in his ninetieth year, after his return from Patmos "to Ephesus[z];" though I know not by what strange sort of mistake he makes it to have been in the reign of the emperor Claudius, instead of the reign of Nerva or Trajan; between the first of which and Claudius there intervened the reigns of seven several emperors, viz. Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. It is plain therefore St. John did not write his Gospel before the reign of Nerva, i. e. not before the year of Christ 97. for sooner he could not return from Patmos; but whether he wrote it in that year immediately after his return, or some time later, I shall not inquire. This is, I think, the most received opinion about the time of St. John's writing his Gospel; nor is there any considerable difference between the later fathers and Epiphanius on this head. The author of the Martyrdom of Timothy (if I understand his words right) asserts the same as Epiphanius, viz. that he wrote it after his return from Patmos to Ephesus[a]; and so does Isidore Hispalensis[b]. Dorotheus differs only in saying that he wrote it during his exile state in Patmos, and published it afterwards by Gaius at Ephesus[c]; and this is only one year's difference. There are indeed some manuscripts[d] and later writers, as Theophylact[e], &c. who *will have this Gospel written much sooner*, viz. about the year of Christ 65. viz. thirty-two years after our Saviour's ascension; but the authority of these is so small in respect of those above mentioned, that I need say no more, had not Mr. Whiston fallen in with their opinion[f]. He offers indeed several reasons for it, in which I cannot see the least show of evidence: the bare proposing them would be a sufficient confutation of them. The most considerable of them is the fourth, viz. that John, ch. v. ver. 2. *speaks of the pool of Bethesda* in the *present tense*, there is at Jerusalem, and not

[z] Loc. jam cit.
[a] Apud Phot. Cod. 254.
[b] Inter Orthodoxogr. vol. 1. p. 598.
[c] In Synops.
[d] Vid. Mill. in calc. Joan.
[e] Præf. in Joan.
[f] Essay on the Constit. p. 19. See concerning the time of St. John's writing his Gospel, Dallæum de Script. Dionys. Areopag. &c. l. 1. c. 16.—p. 102, &c.

there WAS, which better agrees to the time he assigns (as he imagines) *before the destruction of Jerusalem, when that pool and porch were certainly in being, than to the time afterward, when probably both were destroyed.* Dr. Whitby[g], several years before Mr. Whiston, observed and submitted (though at the expense of a contradiction to what he[h] seemed elsewhere to assert) to the force of this argument; "If," says he, "ἔστι δὲ, "THERE IS, be the true reading, as the consent of almost all "the Greek copies argues; it seems to intimate that Jerusalem "and this pool were then standing when St. John wrote this "Gospel; and therefore, that it was written, as Theophylact "and others say, before the destruction of Jerusalem, and not, "as the more ancient fathers thought, long after."

To this I answer;

(1.) That unless *John had certainly known* the destruction of this particular place at Jerusalem, *it was more proper* for him to speak *in the present time*, as supposing it still standing, than in the past time, asserting what he knew not. And indeed who can suppose that John, at the distance which Ephesus was from Jerusalem, should be particularly informed of the destruction of every particular place in the city?

(2.) That in all probability *the pool was not filled up, but still in the same state after the destruction of Jerusalem, as before.* Pools were of great service, and as it probably could answer no end for the conquerors to destroy it, so it would be a prodigious work to fill it up, especially if the accounts, which we have of the several streams that fed it, may be depended upon[i]. Add to this, that Tertullian[k] says, this pool lost its virtue after Christ's time, undoubtedly referring to times after the destruction of the city, which supposes the pool still standing.

(3.) Suppose the pool was destroyed, and John to have known it, *there is no impropriety in using the verb* ἐστὶ, nothing being more common among writers, than to use verbs in the present tense to denote the preterperfect tense. This is especially remarkable in, and observed by all the critics on, the New

[g] Annot. in loc.
[h] Pref. to John.
[i] See Dr. Lightfoot, Chorogr. Inquiry prefixed to his Exercitations on John, ch. v.
[k] Adv. Jud. cap. 13.

Testament. See instances in Glassius, Gram. Sacr. l. 3. Tract. 3. Can. 48.

(4.) Several of the ancient manuscripts and versions read the verb in the past time. (See Dr. Mill Annot. in loc.) and so Nonnus paraphrases the place.

Ἦν δέ τις εὐποίητος ἐν εὐύδρῳ προβατικῇ
Εὐρυτενὴς ἀσάμινθος———

III. St. John's Gospel *was translated into Hebrew.* The credit of this depends upon what we read in Epiphanius, in the three several places referred to at the bottom of the page [l].

IV. St. John's Gospel *was admired by the Platonists.* Amelius [m] swore, "the Barbarian" (so the Grecians called all but themselves) "was in the right in his account of the WORD," &c. and Austin tells us, "he was informed by Simplicianus, "bishop of Milan, that a certain Platonist said, *the beginning* "*of St. John's Gospel deserved to be written in letters of gold,* "*and to be read in all public assemblies* [n]."

V. *The style* of St. John's Gospel was judged by Dionysius Alexandrinus [o] "to be elegant and pure in respect of the Greek, "and the whole composure to be beautiful in words and thoughts, "without any barbarisms, solecisms, or idiotisms in it, the au- "thor being endowed both with the advantage of learning, and "words, or eloquence." Some of the moderns have very positively determined otherwise; Grotius [p] and Dr. Cave [q] have told us, one after the other, "That his Greek generally abounds with "Syriacisms, his discourses many times abrupt, set off with "frequent antitheses, connected with copulatives, passages often "repeated, things at first more obscurely propounded, and "which he is forced to enlighten with subsequent explications, "words peculiar to himself, and phrases used in an uncommon "sense." How just this is, I shall leave to the reader to determine, only adding a remark of Sixtus Senensis [r], That St. John had this peculiarity in his style, to make *the last word of the former sentence to be the first of the next* [s].

[l] Hæres. 30. §. 3, 6, 12.
[m] Apud Euseb. Præp. Evang. lib. 11. p. 540. See Dr. Cave's Life of St. John, §. 15.
[n] De Civit. Dei, lib. 10. c. 29.
[o] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 7. c. 25.
[p] Annot. in Joan. Titul.
[q] Lib. cit. §. 16.
[r] Bibl. Sanct. lib. 6. Annot. 173.
[s] See Vol. I. of this work, Part I. Ch. XII. p. 71.

CHAP. XV.

St. John's Gospel proved by several arguments to be canonical. An objection against it refuted. It was not wrote by Cerinthus.

THAT which remains further, is to evidence the canonical authority of St. John's Gospel, by the propositions which are laid down in the first Part, viz.

Arg. I. St. John's Gospel is to be esteemed canonical by Prop. IV. because *it is found in all the catalogues of sacred books which we have among the writings of the primitive Christians.* See what is said under this argument in treating of the preceding Gospels, and how it is in the catalogue of Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, that of the council of Laodicea, Epiphanius, Gregory Nazianzen, Philastrius, Jerome, Ruffin, Austin, that in the third council of Carthage, and in the books under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. Vol. I. Part I. Ch. VIII.

Arg. II. The Gospel of St. John is canonical, because *it is cited and appealed to as scripture in the writings of the primitive Christians*, by Prop. V.

I shall here, as in treating of the former books, shew the several places of those ancient authors who have cited this Gospel. It is cited,

I. By CLEMENS ROMANUS.

I find but one place in his Epistles wherein he appears to have cited St. John, viz. Epist. 1. §. 49. he manifestly uses those words of this Gospel, ch. x. 15.

II. By BARNABAS.

The author of this Epistle seems plainly to have made use of this Gospel, ch. 7. for he there not only mentions the circumstance of our Saviour's *being pierced at his crucifixion*, which is related only by St. John, (xix. 34.) but manifestly applies that prophecy, Zech. xii. 10. *And they shall look upon me whom they have pierced*, to this circumstance of Christ's passion; as St. John also does, ver. 37. What strengthens and seems to render this evidence undeniable is, that the author cannot be supposed to have thus applied the prophecy from his own reading of it in the prophet; for he, not being a Jew, un-

derstood not the Hebrew, but must be supposed to have cited (as he usually does) out of the LXX. Version. Now the LXX. have rendered this place very different from the Hebrew, and that through a blunder or mistake in their reading, confounding ד with ר and ר with ד in one and the same word, reading, viz. רקדו instead of דקרו, and so translating *κατωρχήσαντο*, *they insulted*, instead of *ἐξεκέντησαν*, *they pierced*; as St. John, following the Hebrew, does rightly translate. This observation of the LXX.'s mistake was first made by Jerome [t], and after him by Erasmus, Beza, Lightfoot, Hammond, and other critics on John xix. 37. Hence it is plain, that the author of this Epistle did certainly use St. John's Gospel; and what is further remarkable to my purpose, uses the very same verb [u]. I am sensible indeed, that some of the old Greek copies have these words as St. John; but it is plain from Jerome, that it was not so in the old LXX. and if it was so in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, or Theodotion, these were made after the time in which the author of this Epistle is supposed to have wrote.

III. By Ignatius.

St. John's *Gospel.*	*The lesser Epistles of* Ignatius.
1 Ch. v. 19, 30. and viii. 28.	1 Epist. ad Magnes. ch. vii.
2 Ch. i. 1, &c.	2 —— ch. viii.
3 Ch. xii. 31. xiv. 30. xvi. 11. viz. the title given Satan, *The prince of this world.*	3 —— ad Roman. ch. vii. *Ἀρχὼν τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.*

IV. By Justin Martyr.

St. John's *Gospel.*	Justin Martyr's *Works.*
1 Ch. i. 1, &c.	1 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 284, 285.
2 —— 14.	2 Apolog. 2. pro Christ. p. 74.
3 Ch. iii. 3.	3 Apolog. p. 94.

[t] Ad Pammach. de optimo Genere Interpret. c. 3. An instance of a like mistake committed by the LXX. the learned may observe, Amos ix. 12. where instead of the Hebrew words, ירשו שארית אדום i. e. that *they may possess the remnant of Edom*, the LXX. read אדם for אדום and ירשו for ירשו, i. e. *that the residue of men might seek the Lord.* This is the more considerable, because the LXX. are followed in this translation by St. James, in his inspired discourse, Acts xv. 17.

[u] St. John's word is *ἐξεκέντησαν*, and Barnabas's *κατανυντήσαντες*.

St. John's *Gospel.*	Justin Martyr's *Works.*
4 Ch. iii. 14.	4 Dialog. cum Tryph. Jud. p. 322.
5 Ch. xix. 9.	5 Dialog. p. 329.

V. By Theophilus Antiochenus.

In his second book to Autolycus, he cites John i. 1, 2, &c. and introduces it thus, Διδάσκουσιν ἡμᾶς αἱ ἅγιαι γραφαὶ, καὶ πάντες οἱ πνευματοφόροι, ἐξ ὧν Ἰωάννης λέγει, &c. i. e. "So the holy "scriptures teach, and all the *inspired writers*, among whom "is John, who saith, *In the beginning was the Word*," &c.

VI. By Irenæus.

I have observed above, treating of St. Matthew's Gospel, that Feuardentius, at the end of his edition of this father, has made with great exactness an index of most of the citations made by Irenæus from St. Matthew. The same is to be said of his index of St. John, in which though he has not collected all, yet he has most of, the references made to it. I have examined all those, and observed several others, and dare affirm, that Irenæus has appealed to, or cited this Gospel, in above one hundred and twenty several places. It would be needless to transcribe them. I shall select only those places where St. John's Gospel is referred to by name, viz.

1 John i. 1, &c. Adv. Hæres. lib. 1. c. 1. lib. 2. c. 2. lib. 3. c. 11, &c. lib. 5. c. 18. lib. 3. c. 8. lib. 3. c. 18, &c.

2 John iv. 6. lib. 3. c. 32.

3 —— v. 39. lib. 4. c. 23.

4 —— v. 46. lib. 4. c. 3.

5 —— xiii. 25. lib. 3. c. 1.

6 —— xx. 31. lib. 3. c. 18.

I will only observe further from this ancient father, that he several times cites this Gospel under the express and distinguishing name of SCRIPTURE, or THE SCRIPTURE; so for instance, citing John i. 3. (lib. 1. cap. 19.) he introduces it thus, *Quemadmodum scriptura dicit*, i. e. "As THE SCRIPTURE "SAITH." [x] Again, citing John xiv. 6. (lib. 3. c. 5.) he says, he takes his proof *ex scripturis*, i. e. "from the scriptures."

[x] Though the words do indeed introduce another text, yet it is evident they are also to be referred to this.

VII. By Clemens Alexandrinus.

The editor of the Paris edition of this father's works has prefixed a collection of above thirty places, which are cited, as he says, by Clemens out of St. John's Gospel; but, as I have above observed on St. Matthew, his collection is in so many respects inaccurate, false, and defective, that as I could not depend upon it myself, so neither could I refer the reader to it. I have therefore made the following collection, which is just, and may be safely depended upon.

A Collection of the places of St. John's Gospel cited by Clemens Alexandrinus.

St. John's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
1 Chap. i. 1.	1 Admonit. ad Gentes p. 5. et Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 113.
2 ——— 3.	2 Pædagog. lib. 3. c. 5. p. 233. Stromat. lib. 1. p. 292. et lib. 6. p. 662.
3 ——— 12.	3 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 484.
4 ——— 14.	4 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 3. p. 83. et Stromat. lib. 5. p. 553.
5 ——— 16.	5 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 312.
6 ——— 17.	6 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 7. p. 112.
7 ——— 18.	7 Stromat. lib. 5. p. 587.
8 ——— 27.	8 ——— p. 573.
9 ——— 29.	9 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 5. p. 91, 92.
10 Ch. ii. 7.	10 ——— lib. 2. c. 2. p. 156.
11 Ch. iii. 6.	11 Stromat. lib. 3. p. 462.
12 ——— 16.	12 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 94. et Strom. lib. 5. p. 591.
13 ——— 19.	13 Admonit. ad Gentes, p. 63.
14 Ch. iv. 6.	14 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 9. p. 126.
15 ——— 7.	15 ——— lib. 2. c. 3. p. 161.
16 ——— 32.	16 ——— lib. 1. c. 6. p. 104.
17 Ch. v. 24.	17 ——— c. 6. p. 93.
18 Ch. vi. 27.	18 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 272. Stromat. lib. 3. p. 463.
19 ——— 32.	19 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 104.
20 ——— 36.	20 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 542.
21 ——— 39.	21 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 6. p. 94.

St. John's *Gospel.*	*The Works of* Clemens Alexandrinus.
22 Ch. vi. 51.	22 Pædagog. c. 6. p. 100, 101, 102.
23 Ch. vii. 16.	23 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 312.
24 ——— 18.	24 Ibid.
25 ——— 33.	25 Stromat. lib. 4. p. 468. Stromat. lib. 6. p. 666.
26 Ch. viii. 24.	26 ——— lib. 5. p. 591.
27 ——— 34, 35.	27 ——— lib. 2. p. 368.
28 ——— 44.	28 ——— lib. 1. p. 311.
29 Ch. x. 1.	29 ——— lib. 5. p. 590.
30 —— 7, 9.	30 Admonit. ad Gentes, p. 8.
31 —— 8.	31 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 309.
32 —— 11.	32 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 7. p. 108. Pædagog. c. 9. p. 126. Pædagog. c. 11. p. 133.
33 Ch. xi. 43.	33 ——— lib. 1. c. 2. p. 81.
34 Ch. xiii. 5, &c.	34 ——— lib. 2. c. 3. p. 161.
35 Ch. xiv. 6.	35 Stromat. lib. 1. p. 285. Stromat. lib. 5. p. 553.
36 Ch. xv. 1.	36 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 115. Stromat. lib. 1. p. 291.
37 ——— 11, 12.	37 Stromat. lib. 2. p. 391.
38 Ch. xvi. 27.	38 Pædagog. lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 82.
39 Ch. xvii. 23.	39 Ibid.
40 ——— 21—27.	40 Pædagog. lib. 1. c. 8. p. 117, 118.
41 Ch. xx. 29.	41 Stromat. lib. 2. p. 362.
42 Ch. xxi. 9, &c.	42 Pædagog. lib. 2. cap. 1. p. 147.

By all that is above said, it is undeniably evident that this Gospel of St. John was appealed to as scripture in the writings of the first and most early Christians. The matter is so clear, and the citations so numerous in the writings of Tertullian, Origen, Jerome, Austin, &c. that I thought it needless to collect them.

Arg. III. The Gospel of St. John is of canonical authority by Prop. VI. because *it was read as scripture in the assemblies or the churches of the primitive Christians.* Not to repeat what I have above said, for the proof of this I must refer the reader to Vol. I. Part I. Ch. X. of this work, and what is said above, concerning the reading of St. Matthew's Gospel, in this Part, Chap. III.

Arg. IV. The Gospel of St. John is of canonical authority, by Prop. XV. because it *was esteemed as such by the churches of Syria in or near the apostles' time, and accordingly placed by them among their collection of sacred books.*

All the objection which has been made against the authority of this Gospel is, *that it was not written by St. John, but a noted heretic, Cerinthus*, who was cotemporary with St. John. This was first asserted by the heretics whom Epiphanius calls Ἄλογοι, *Alogians*, because they did not believe the Λόγος, or *Word*, spoken of in the first chapter of the Gospel; (see Epiphan. Hæres. 51. §. 1, 2, 3.) Nor do I know that any of the ancient heretics besides these were of this opinion. Sixtus Senensis [y] and Father Simon [z] tell us, the Theodotians, or followers of Theodotus Byzantius, followed the Alogians herein; but I believe these two learned writers were led into this mistake by a too hasty reading of the words of Epiphanius, (Hæres. 51. §. 1.) where this is not asserted of the Theodotians. Mr. Toland indeed has insinuated this objection against the credit of St. John's Gospel [a]; but it is easy to answer him and his brethren the Alogi.

1. *That the Gospel is directly contrary to the doctrines of Cerinthus.* He taught that Christ *was in all respects a mere man*, ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, born as other men. This Gospel evidently *asserts the contrary.* "How can it be," says Epiphanius, §. 4. "that those things should be wrote by Cerinthus which are "directly contrary to Cerinthus?" See this argument further pursued and well managed by that father in the place cited.

2. The ancient writers assure us, that *this Gospel was written by St. John, with the particular intention of confuting the heresy of Cerinthus.* So Irenæus [b], Epiphanius [c], Jerome [d], &c. See this proved above, Ch. XIV. in the beginning.

3. Besides these silly and late heretics, the Alogians, *all the Christians do unanimously ascribe it to St. John.* I call them late, because, according to Epiphanius, (Hær. 51. §. 1.) they did not arise till after the Montanists, i. e. not till after the

[y] Biblioth. Sanct. l. 7. de Evang. Joan. Hæres.

[z] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. ch. 13. p. 117.

[a] Amyntor, p. 65.

[b] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 11.

[c] Hæres. 51. §. 4. et 12.

[d] Præfat. in Comment. in Matt. et Catal. Vir. Illustr. in Joan.

latter end of the second century. The fathers who have ascribed this Gospel to St. John, as its author, are above cited in the preceding chapter; to which I add, that in the Hypotyposes, under the name of Clemens Alexandrinus [e], the author styles him πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα: i. e. "inspired by the Holy "Ghost in writing his Gospel;" and Origen [f] says, this Gospel was received as his among the ἀναντίῤῥητα ἐν τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, i. e. "the books which were admitted "by all the churches in the world." He who has a mind may see more in answer to the opinion of Cerinthus being the author of St. John's Gospel in Epiphanius, Sixtus Senensis, and Father Simon, in the places already cited; and besides these, in the two answers of Mr. Nye [g] and Mr. Richardson [h] to Amyntor, and Dr. Whitby's preface to his Annotations upon this Gospel.

As to the portions of this Gospel which are supposed not to be written by John, viz. the history of the adulterous woman, ch. viii. and the whole last chapter of the Gospel; I have no more to say, than that concerning the former I have said somewhat, Vol. I. Part I. Ch. XVIII. p. 100. and the latter is only a conjecture of Grotius [i], without any solid foundation; as is well judged by the French critics, Father Simon [k] and Du Pin [l]; and after them, by Dr. Mill, Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 249.

CHAP. XVI.

St. Luke was the author of the Acts of the Apostles. This proved from many testimonies of the ancient fathers. An objection from the Synopsis, under the name of Athanasius, refuted. The Acts contain the history of the Christian church for the space of twenty-eight years. The time of St. Luke's writing the Acts discovered. Whether he went to Alexandria? The Acts were soon translated into Hebrew.

I. ST. LUKE, the author of the Gospel under that name,

[e] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 14.
[f] Exposit. in Matt. lib. 1. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 25.
[g] Defence of the Canon, p. 81.
[h] Canon Vindicated, p. 73.
[i] Annot. in Joan. xx. 30.
[k] Crit. Hist. New Test. loc. cit.
[l] Hist. of the Canon of the New Test. vol. 2. c. 2. §. 6.

was also the author of the book, entitled, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. This is apparent from the constant testimony of all antiquity, the matter being never once questioned by any of the catholic church. I shall mention only those which are most ancient.

1. Irenæus has in several places *ascribed this history to St. Luke, as its author;* for instance, citing the history, Acts viii. 9. he introduces it thus: "Luke, the disciple and follower of "the apostles, says thus, *A certain man, named Simon* [m];" in another place [n], citing Acts xv. 39, &c. he saith, "Luke was "the inseparable companion and fellow-labourer of Paul, and "wrote thus," viz. concerning the contention of Paul and Barnabas; and then proceeds largely to prove, that St. Luke was the constant companion of St. Paul, because in the Acts, chap. xvi. 10, 11, 12, 16, 17. and chap. xx. xxi. and xxvii. he speaks in the *first person plural*, WE endeavoured, WE came, WE went, WE sat down, and WE spake, &c. all which proves that Irenæus looked upon Luke as the undoubted author of this book. The same he proves from several places of St. Paul's Epistles, (viz. 2 Tim. iv. 11. Col. iv. 14.) and concludes from the whole *St. Luke's fitness for writing a just and true history*. In another place [o] he shews, that St. Luke's Acts of the Apostles *ought to be equally received with his Gospel; for that in them he has carefully delivered to us the truth, and given us a sure rule for salvation*, &c. Again, lib. 3. c. 13. he observes, that *St. Paul's account*, Gal. ii. 1. of the time when he went to Jerusalem, *exactly agrees with Luke's account in the Acts*. Lastly, this father, citing part of Stephen's speech, Acts vii. introduces it thus, "So Luke writes," &c. [p]

2. Clemens Alexandrinus [q], citing *Paul's speech at Athens*, Acts xvii. 22, &c. introduces it, "So Luke in the Acts of the "Apostles relates that Paul said," &c.

3. The author of the Hypotyposes, under the name of Clemens Alexandrinus [r], speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews,

[m] Discipulus et sectator apostolorum ait, *Vir quidam, nomine Simon*, &c. adv. Hæres. lib. 1. c. 20.

[n] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 14.

[o] Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 15.

[p] Lucas Stephanum sic dixisse scripsit. Adv. Hæres. lib. 4. c. 29.

[q] Καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπομνημονεύει τὸν Παῦλον λέγοντα. Strom. lib. 5. p. 588.

[r] Οθεν τὸν αὐτὸν χρῶτα εὑρίσκεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ταύτης τε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῶν Πράξεων. Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. c. 14.

says it was translated out of its original Hebrew, in which it was written by Paul, into Greek by Luke; whence, says he, we may observe, that there is a "great likeness in the style of "that Epistle and the Acts of the Apostles;" from whence it is manifest, this author esteemed Luke the author of the Acts of the Apostles.

4. Tertullian cites several places out of the Acts of the Apostles, which he calls *Commentarius Lucæ*, i. e. "the Commen- "tary of Luke [s]."

5. Origen ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to Luke [t].

6. Eusebius saith, "Luke has left us two inspired volumes, "viz. the Gospel and the Acts [u]."

7. Jerome also expressly asserts the Acts to be *the composure of Luke* [x].

8. *Several ancient manuscript Greek copies have the name of St. Luke prefixed to this history;* (Simon, Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 14.) as also hath the old Syriac version, which seems in this case to have some weight, as agreeing with all antiquity.

From all this testimony my proposition is abundantly evident; nor have I met with any thing which can be objected hereto, unless that it be made an objection, which we read in the author of the *Synopsis Scripturarum*, under the name of Athanasius, viz. that "Peter dictated the Acts of the Apostles, "but Luke wrote them [y];" but it is easy to reply,

1. *That one single testimony is not to be credited against the universal concurrence of antiquity.*

2. It is very evident that *Luke wrote the greatest part of this book of his own knowledge*, and so had no need of any one to dictate to him. And hence Eusebius says, "he wrote the "Acts not from tradition or hearsay, but as what he saw and "heard [z];" and Jerome expressly [a], "he wrote the Acts from "what himself saw." Besides, as Luke was the constant com-

[s] Lib. de jejun. advers. Psych. cap. 10.

[t] Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, καὶ τὰς Πράξεις. Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. c. 25. It may indeed be questioned, whether these are the words of Origen, or Eusebius himself.

[u] Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 4.

[x] Catalog. Viror. Illustr. in Joan.

[y] Τὰς Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὑπηγόρευσε μὲν Πέτρος ὁ ἀποστόλος, συνεγράψατο δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς Λουκᾶς. Vid. Synops.

[z] Loc. cit.

[a] Acta apostolorum, sicut viderat, composuit. Loc. cit.

panion of Paul, he was more capable of writing his history, which is the greatest part of the book, than Peter could be.

II. *The Acts of the Apostles*, written by St. Luke, *contain the history of the infant state of the Christian church, for the space of about twenty-eight years.* He begins this history where his gospel-history ended, viz. with an account of our Saviour's ascension, and what followed in the church afterwards. He ends his history with the relation of Paul's being brought to Rome, and his abode there for the space of two years (xxviii. 30, 31.) Hence the truth of the proposition will be clearly evinced; for, whereas our Saviour ascended in the year from his birth 33, and St. Paul went to Rome in the fourth or fifth year of Nero's reign; i. e. in the year of Christ 58, or rather 59; if we add to this number the two years of his abode there, with which account the history of the Acts is concluded, it will produce the year 61, which from the year 33 makes just twenty-eight years.

There is indeed the difference of *two years* between the above account and that of bishop Pearson [b], Spanheim [c], Dr. Mill [d], and some others; but as the difference is so small, and my account is conformable to the common chronology of Christianity, I shall say no more.

COROLL. *Hence we see* near to what time *this history of the Acts was written*, viz. *either in the year of Christ 62, or not long after.* It being altogether probable, that St. Luke would not defer his writing long after his departure from St. Paul; which seems to have been now, when the apostle was set at liberty from his confinement at Rome. I have above observed, (Chap. XI.) treating of St. Luke's Gospel, that St. Luke continued at Rome after St. Paul went thence; and there it is probable he wrote very soon both his Gospel and Acts. That he wrote them both in the same year seems very probable, as it is certain that one of them is only to be looked upon as the second part, or continuation of the other. Dr. Grabe [e], to serve a particular design, and after him Dr. Mill [f], suppose St. Luke to have gone, immediately upon his parting from St. Paul, into

[b] Annal. Paulin. p. 18.
[c] Histor. Christ. Sæcul. 1. §. 6.
[d] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 121.
[e] Spicileg. Patr. tom. 1. p. 32, 33.
[f] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 114. et 121.

Egypt, and there at Alexandria to have published both his Gospel and Acts of the Apostles, A. D. 64. The foundation of this opinion is partly the assertion of it in the title of the Syriac version, and partly the credit of the Constitutions of the Apostles, in which it is said, that Luke ordained Avilius, second bishop of Alexandria, (lib. 7. c. 46.) but neither of these are of any weight, the titles and epigraphs of this version not being of very certain authority, and the Constitutions of the Apostles of much less, or none at all.

III. The Acts of the Apostles seem to have been very early translated out of Greek into Hebrew. This, Epiphanius tells us[g], he had by information from several Jews, and afterwards[h], that one Josephus found a copy of the Acts in Hebrew in the Jewish archives at Tiberias.

CHAP. XVII.

The Acts of the Apostles proved to be canonical by various arguments. A mistake of some learned men corrected; viz. that the Acts were not so much known or regarded, as the other books of the New Testament. A passage of a book under the name of Chrysostom to this purpose, largely considered. Who among the ancient heretics rejected the Acts.

Arg. I. THE Acts of the Apostles are of canonical authority by Prop. IV. because it is found in all the catalogues of sacred books, which we have in the writings of the primitive Christians. See Vol. I. Part I. Ch. VIII.

Arg. II. The Acts of the Apostles are of canonical authority, because they are cited and appealed to as scripture, in the writings of the primitive Christians, by Prop. V. as will appear from the following instances.

The Acts of the Apostles are cited,

I. By CLEMENS ROMANUS, Epist. 1. *ad Corinth.*

Ch. 2. He cites the words, which are Acts xx. 35.

Ch. 18. *He certainly made use of, and appears to have read,* Acts xiii. 22; for, whereas Paul in that place manifestly cites Psalm lxxxix. 20. and makes an addition or paraphrase in

[g] Hæres. 30. Ebionit. §. 3. [h] Ibid. §. 6. et §. 12.

the citation, inserting those words, κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, which are not in the psalm, Clemens citing the same psalm has inserted Paul's addition. Nor is there any room to object, *that perhaps they both cited according to the Septuagint;* for there are no such words in any of the copies of the Septuagint, nor any various reading like it to be found.

II. By POLYCARP, *Epist. ad Philipp.*

Ch. 1. He cites those words of Peter's speech, which are recorded Acts ii. 24.

III. By JUSTIN MARTYR.

Cohort. ad Græc. p. 11. he cites Acts vii. 22. viz. *that Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.* And as Justin could not gather this out of the book of Exodus, so among other reasons it is certain he did not, because he cites those whom he calls σοφώτατοι τῶν ἱστοριογράφων, those excellent historians, who wrote Moses's life and actions; which cannot refer to the Pentateuch.

In the book under Justin's name, undoubtedly ancient, the Acts are often referred to; e. g. Exposit. Fidei de rect. Confess. p. 375. reference is made to Acts ix. 15. and Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox. which perhaps is partly Justin's, it is often cited, viz. Acts i. 7. Quæst. 112. iv. 18. Respons. ad Quæst. 24. et Respons. ad Quæst. 108. vii. 22. Quæst. 25. x. per tot. Quæst. 89. xxiii. 3. Quæst. 125. and many other places.

IV. By IRENÆUS.

This father has often appealed to these Acts of St. Luke: I have made the following collection.

The Acts of the Apostles.	*The Works of* IRENÆUS.
1 Chap. i. 7.	1 Lib. 1. adv. Hæres. c. 33.
2 ——— 8.	2 Ib. 3. c. 1.
3 ——— 16, 17.	3 ——— 12.
4 ——— 20.	4 ——— 12. et lib. 1. c. 36.
5 Ch. ii. 15, 16, 17, 22, 29.	5 ——— 12.
6 —— 41.	6 Ib. 4. c. 40.
7 Ch. iii. 6, 7, 8, 12.	7 Ib. 3. c. 12.
8 Ch. iv. 8, 9, 24, 31, 33.	8 Ib. p. 264.
9 —— 32.	9 Ib. 1. c. 3.
10 Ch. v. 30, 42.	10 Ib. 3. c. 12.

The Acts of the Apostles.	*The Works of* IRENÆUS.
11 Ch. vii. 2—7.	11 Lib. 3. c. 12. N. B. *Here he calls this book scripture several times.*
12 ——— 38, 39, 40.	12 Lib. 29. *Here Luke is named.*
13 ——— 56, &c.	13 Ib. 3. c. 12.
14 Ch. viii. 9.	14 Ib. 1. c. 20. *Here Luke is named also, and called a disciple and companion of the apostles.*
15 ——— 17.	15 Ib. 4. c. 75.
16 ——— 20, &c.	16 Ib. 1. c. 20.
17 ——— 30, &c.	17 Ib. 4. c. 40. et lib. 3. c. 12.
18 ——— 33, 37.	18 Ib.
19 Ch. ix. 4, 5, &c.	19 Ib.
20 ——— 4, 5, 15, 16.	20 Ib. 3. c. 15. *Here Irenæus argues for the credit of Luke and his Acts.*
21 ——— 20.	21 Ib. 3. c. 12.
22 Ch. x. 1, &c. 25.	22 Ib.
23 —— 28.	23 Ib.
24 —— 35, 37.	24 Ib.
25 Ch. xiv. 15.	25 Ib.
26 Ch. xv. 7, &c.	26 Ib.
27 ——— 23, &c.	27 Ib.
28 Ch. xvi. 9, &c.	28 Ib. 3. c. 14. *This whole chapter is taken up in asserting the credit of St. Luke, and the usefulness of his writings.*
29 Ch. xvii. 24—31.	29 ——— 12.
30 Ch. xx. 6.	30 ——— 14.

V. By CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.

The Acts of the Apostles.	*The Works of* CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.
1 Ch. vi. 2.	1 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 7. p. 172.
2 Ch. x. 11—16.	2 ——— lib. 2. c. 1. p. 149.

The Acts of the Apostles.	*The Works of* CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.
3 Ch. x. 34, 35.	3 Stromat. lib. 6. p. 646.
4 Ch. xv. 28, &c.	4 Pædagog. lib. 2. c. 7. p. 172. et Strom. lib. 4. p. 512.
5 Ch. xvii. 22, &c.	5 Stromat. lib. 5. p. 588. *Here Luke is cited by name as the author of the Acts.*
6 ——— 24, &c.	6 ——— p. 584. *See this speech of Paul, also Strom.* lib. 1. p. 314, 315.
7 Ch. xxvi. 17, &c.	7 Ib.

VI. By TERTULLIAN.

He makes very numerous appeals to, and citations from these Acts; it would be tedious to collect them all; I choose rather to observe, that this father cites it under the express name of *scripture:* "which part of scripture," says he, "they "who do not receive, must deny the descent of the Holy "Ghost, and be ignorant of the infant state of the Christian "church[i]." In like manner he calls it *scripture* in another place[k], *disputes* against the Marcionites, and *condemns* them for rejecting the Acts, proving *their truth and genuineness by* the testimonies of St. Paul in his Epistles, and in another place[l] expressly calls it the *composure of Luke.* I will not tire the reader with any more collections of the fathers' appeals to these Acts. The later fathers cite them continually, as the only authentic history they had, of the primitive state of the church. I proceed:

Arg. III. The Acts of the Apostles are canonical, *because they were read as scripture in the churches or assemblies of the Christians in the first ages,* by Prop. VI. For the evidence of this, it will be sufficient to consult Vol. I. Part I. Ch. X. and what is above said, concerning the reading of St. Matthew's Gospel, in this Part, Ch. III.

COROLL. I. From this and the preceding arguments it is

[i] Quam scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritum Sanctum possunt agnoscere, discentibus missum, &c. De Præscript. adv. Hæretic. cap. 22.

[k] Scripturam Actorum apostolorum confirmat. Adv. Marcion. l. 5. c. 2.

[l] *Commentarium Lucæ.* Lib. de Jejun. adv. Psych. cap. 10.

evident, that several learned men are *very grossly mistaken*, who conclude, that the Acts of the Apostles *were less known, less read, and less regarded in the first centuries, than the other books of the New Testament.* The foundation of their opinion is a passage in the Prolegomena upon the Acts, under the name of Chrysostom [m], which begins thus: "This book is "not so much as known to many; they know neither the "book, nor by whom it was written." Hence those, who always labour to lessen the credit of the canon, have drawn fine conclusions.

1. Father Simon [n] concludes hence, that *the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul were then* (viz. in Chrysostom's time, i. e. in the fifth century) *only accounted to belong to the New Testament:* "perhaps," says he, "none but these two works were "read in the churches in those primitive ages."

2. Dr. Mill [o], after having said the Gospels were soon spread into every one's hands, adds, "The case was not so with the "other books of the New Testament; for the books of the "Acts being of somewhat less usefulness than the Gospel of "Luke, as containing the history, not of Christ, but of his "apostles, or rather indeed only of Paul, was neither read in "the churches, nor wrote out but by very few;" then he cites the passage of Chrysostom above produced.

Thus did these two learned men endeavour, without any arguments, to lessen the credit of this sacred book: for if my preceding arguments are good, and the Acts of the Apostles be in all the catalogues of the sacred books among the ancients; if it was cited by all the first Christians in their writings, and was read in their churches; (all which I have undeniably proved;) with what face could these gentlemen tell the world, that it was not read nor known among the Christians? The book appears, by all the writings of antiquity, to have been almost as much known as the Gospels themselves, and as constantly used: but their refuge is the passage of Chrysostom: he says, "It was not known to many." To which I reply,

[m] Πολλοῖς τουτὸ τὸ βιβλίον οὐδ' ὅτι γνώριμόν ἐστιν, οὔτε αὐτὸ, οὔτε ὁ γράψας αὐτὸ καὶ συνθείς. Vid. Mill. Præf. in Act. p. 254.

[n] Critic. Hist. of the N. T. part 1. ch. 14.

[o] Proleg. in N. T. §. 242, 243.

1. *That this does not appear to be the work of Chrysostom*, and Dr. Mill himself[p] suspected it: *Chrysostomus*, says he, *vel alius quispiam sub ejus nomine*, &c. Bellarmine indeed contends for its genuineness[q]. Erasmus[r] seems to have thought that it was not his; and so it is most probable.

2. It does not follow, that, *because several persons, or most, in the country, where this author wrote, were ignorant of the Acts; that therefore it was not known to the greatest part of the Christian church.* Erasmus supposes[s], that the author means only, that *it was unknown to the rabble; but the learned know it.* It is much better explained by the learned Fabricius[t]: "These words," says he, "rather shew, that the "wretched ignorance and laziness of some particular persons "was condemned by Chrysostom, than the negligence of the "universal church in his time."

3. If Chrysostom himself had positively asserted that the Acts of the Apostles were not known and read in his time, he ought not to be believed, because the evidence is so plain to the contrary from so many authors.

4. Add to this, that Chrysostom himself in another place saith, that the Acts of the Apostles was wont to be read in their churches after Easter, and before Whitsuntide; for this he assigns this reason, that nothing can more convictively evidence the resurrection of Christ, which is the basis of all our religion, than the pouring forth of the Holy Ghost, and the propagation of the Gospel by their ministry over the world; all which is recorded in the Acts. Vid. Fabric. Cod. Apocr. N. T. Præfat. in tom. 2. And this, by the way, seems to me no small evidence of what I have above said, viz. that the book upon the Acts, from whence the passage under debate was taken, was not made by Chrysostom; if it was, Chrysostom must contradict himself in a plain matter of fact, viz. In one place he asserts the book not to be known; and in another, that it was publicly read in the churches.

[p] Proleg. in N. T. §. 242, 243.
[q] De Script. Eccles. in Chrysostom.
[r] Annot. in Act. i. 1.
[s] Ibid.
[t] Sed apparet hisce verbis potius supinam quorundam inscitiam et torporem, quam publicam Ecclesiæ suorum temporum negligentiam, a viro disertissimo reprehendi et increpari. Cod. Apoc. N. T. t. 2. p. 751.

Erasmus, though he seems not to give any credit to the passage under the name of Chrysostom, yet, for another reason, concludes the Acts were not so much known in the Greek church, as the Gospels and Paul's Epistles, viz. "because," as he says, *major erat lectionis varietas*, "he found more various "lections in the MSS. of this, than any other of the sacred "books." What this learned critic means, I know not; if his argument will prove any thing, it is the direct contrary; for the more various lections there are of any book, the more often it has been transcribed, and consequently the more it appears to have been in use.

Arg. IV. The Acts of the Apostles are canonical, because the book is found among those which were received by the churches of Syria as such, and which they collected together as scripture, and translated; Prop. XV.

From what is said, it appears that the Acts have as much evidence of their genuineness and canonical authority, as they need to have, or can be supposed to have, at this distance of time from their writing. I know nothing that has been objected against the authority of this sacred volume; nor indeed that can be, unless it should be said, that *some of the first and most early heretics of the church did not receive it as scripture.* The fact is indeed certain. The Acts appear to have been rejected by several of them. Tertullian tells us, that Cerdo (whose disciple Marcion was) rejected the Acts as false [u]; and in the same book [x] disputes against some whom he does not name, who denied this part of scripture; and in his dispute against Marcion [y], confutes him and his disciples for their absurd opinion of rejecting the Acts. Philastrius informs us, that the Cerinthians also did not receive it [z]: as Austin likewise [a], that the Manichees did not, because they looked upon Manes, or Manichæus, *to be the Paraclete foretold, John* xvi. *whereas the Acts of the Apostles expressly declare it* to have been the Holy Ghost, who descended upon the apostles. I have carefully examined the several places where these he-

[u] Lib. de Præscript. adv. Hæretic. c. 51. Acta apostolorum quasi falsa rejicit. Vid. Pamel. Annot. in loc.

[x] Cap. 22. Quam scripturam qui non recipiunt, nec Spiritum Sanctum possunt agnoscere, &c.

[y] Adv. Marcion. lib. 5. c. 2.

[z] Hæres. 26.

[a] De Utilitate credendi, ad Honorat. cap. 3.

retics are said to have rejected the Acts, but find not any one reason assigned for their doing so. But to end in Father Simon's words[b]: "Let us leave these enthusiasts, who had no "other reason to refuse the books that were approved by the "whole church, than this, that they did not suit with the idea "which they had formed of the Christian religion."

[b] Critic. Hist. of New Test. part 1. c. 14. in fine.

A

VINDICATION

OF

THE FORMER PART

OF

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL,

FROM

MR. WHISTON'S CHARGE OF DISLOCATIONS.

OR

An Attempt to prove, that our present Greek copies of that Gospel are in the same order, wherein they were originally written by that Evangelist.

IN WHICH ARE CONTAINED

Many things relating to the Harmony and History of the Four Gospels.

BY JEREMIAH JONES.

TO

MR. SAMUEL JONES.

SIR,

OF all those various studies in which mankind are employed, there are none in which the Christian should more heartily engage, than those which have a tendency to advance the honour, and promote the knowledge, of the sacred scriptures.

The understanding the two original languages, in which the Bible was written, an acquaintance with the dialects of the Hebrew, the ancient Versions of the Old and New Testament, the customs of the Jews, and other neighbouring nations, are means very necessary for obtaining these ends. By these and some other such means, very great advances were made towards the knowledge of the scriptures, in the beginning of the last century. Difficulties, which before seemed insuperable, were solved, and seeming contradictions, which gave occasion to the enemies of Christianity to *blaspheme the good word of God*, were by these means happily and fully reconciled. Grotius, Scaliger, Casaubon, Drusius, Spanheim, Hammond, Lightfoot, &c. to the great advantage of Christianity, employed their endeavours in these studies; and nothing is more to be lamented, than that so few since their time have followed their example, and endeavoured to promote the same sort of knowledge.

How unwearied and successful your endeavours, sir, have been, to revive this sort of learning among

us, there are many who will gratefully acknowledge, and future generations will have just occasion to own. It is owing to you, sir, and your instructions, that a great number of youth are now employed in endeavours, by the use of the forementioned means, to understand, and make others understand, the sacred scripture. I design not to fill an epistle with any of the trite nauseous flattering expressions of which dedications ordinarily consist. Flattery is what, I know, you necessarily hate, and, to speak your praise, I need not. All I design is to improve the opportunity I now have, publicly to acknowledge myself obliged to you for all the proficiency I have made, either in the forementioned, or any other studies, and withal to express my desire of your future greater success in your useful work.

Go on then, sir, and may Heaven still bless you with the continuance of your health, and desired success; may you still be the happy instrument of making many fit for public usefulness, and eminent service to the church of Christ, and the interest of true religion.

This, sir, is the very earnest desire of

Your most obliged

Humble servant,

JEREMIAH JONES.

THE PREFACE.

EVERY one who makes a profession of Christianity, does thereby oblige himself to use his utmost endeavours, in all possible instances, for the support, defence, and advancement of that excellent religion; and if in this matter our zeal and diligence ought to be proportionable to the industry and numbers of those who would subvert our religion, perhaps there never was a time in which our zeal and diligence should be greater. Irreligion indeed, *in its practice*, has been the reproach of all ages, but its open and public defence seems to be peculiar to ours. It is but of late that men have learnt to secure the undisturbed possession of their vices and immoralities, by a professed disbelief of the grand maxims of piety and virtue. It is but of late that it has been reckoned *a perfection*, boldly to beat down and level the eternal *differences of good and evil.* In many companies he now makes the best figure who gives the largest proofs of his profaneness; and he is a man of the greatest fire and wit, that dares to speak most contemptibly of God and his providence. It is now become a fashionable accomplishment, wittily to deride and droll upon sacred things, and boldly to doubt and disbelieve every thing in the sacred scriptures, *only because it is there.*

How it comes to pass that profaneness and scepticism should so much abound in the present age, may very well deserve a serious inquiry. Among other unhappy causes, I cannot but believe the growing disbelief and contempt of revealed religion, and that growth of profaneness which necessarily follows such disbelief, are very much owing to the imprudent treatment the sacred scriptures have met with from many of those who profess to believe their inspiration. The many methods that have been taken (even by several of the Christian clergy) *to render the canon of scripture uncertain;* the preferring some *sorry*

versions before the originals, and consequently correcting and altering the originals by these versions; *the great freedoms that have been taken with the sacred text*, by a groundless supposition of corruptions and contradictions therein, have been the unhappy means of making many reject the revelation itself. The unguarded discourses of divers learned and ingenious men on those heads have supplied the enemies of Christianity with arguments against it, and been many ways improved by evil minds to its dishonour. These are the weapons with which Hobbes, Spinoza [a], Toland [b], and the *club of Deists* or *free-thinkers* [c] (as they love to be called) have fought against all revealed religion; and it is but too well known, how easily weak and degenerate minds have been influenced and imposed upon by their sophistry.

Among the various methods that have been taken to weaken the credit of the holy scriptures, I cannot but reckon that which Mr. Whiston has taken, to reconcile the difference which there is between St. Matthew and the other Evangelists, *in point of time*, to be one. The third proposition of his Harmony is, that "the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel, in our "present copies, is very much misplaced, contrary to the me-"thod and order originally intended by the evangelist." He accounts for this by supposing, "that the several parts or pe-"riods of this former part of St. Matthew's Gospel were writ-"ten at first separately, and upon several distinct papers; "which papers, or whatever they were written upon, were put "together into their present order by those who did not per-"fectly know the true series of the history." These distinct pieces of paper must have been (according to this supposition) about twenty in number, of very unequal sizes, some containing several chapters, others but a few verses, and others not above one or two lines. Such a proposition, and such consequences, must needs tend to lessen the value and authority of this Gospel, and make it less to be depended upon than any common profane history.

Hence Spinoza and Father Simon (who have laboured above all men to prove the uncertainty of the sacred text) suppose

[a] Tractat. Theolog. Politic. c. 8, 9.
[b] In his Amyntor.
[c] Discourse of Free-Thinking, p. 85, 86, &c.

several parts of the writings of the Old Testament transposed and disordered. The former tells us, "that if we will observe "how little regard is had to the order of time, in the five "books of Moses, we shall easily perceive that the several "parts of it were confusedly set together[d]." The latter tells us, "that we are not to attribute to Moses, the little order "which is to be found in some places of the Pentateuch: it is," says he, "more probable, that, as in those times the books were "written on little scrolls or separate sheets, that were sewed "together, the order of these sheets might be changed[e]." Mr. Whiston in another book (viz. his Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies) is of the same opinion concerning the books of the Old Testament; "I must," says he, "be so free and fair "to confess, I cannot every where look upon the present "order, either of the histories or prophecies of the Old Testa-"ment, to have been the original one, or that which was in-"tended by the penmen of them[f]." How direct a tendency such an opinion as this has, to weaken the authority and lessen the value of these sacred books, is but too evident. Mr. Whiston does himself call his proposition *a new and strange one*, and is very careful to guard himself against those censures and imputations to which so bold an assertion did expose him. He easily foresaw, that so severe an attack made upon one, and by consequence upon all the sacred writers, must needs meet with the warmest resentment from every mind that had just value for the inspired volume. After a close and impartial consideration of Mr. Whiston's proposition, I not only concluded it false, but very injurious to the honour of this Gospel, and therefore resolved (according to my ability) to vindicate this part of the Gospel history from so great an injury. This is the design of the following discourse. It were to be wished some more able person had undertaken this work sooner, when Mr. Whiston's book first came out. But if his assertion be proved false, it is better now than not at all; *Sat cito, si sat bene.*

I should do Mr. Whiston injustice, if I did not here mention, that he has changed his opinion in respect of St. Matthew's

[d] Tractat. Theolog. Polit. c. 9. b. 1. c. 5. p. 40.
[e] Critic. Histor. of the Old Testam. [f] Page 67.

Gospel being originally written in Hebrew; but I must desire the reader also to observe, that the information Mr. Whiston was pleased to give me of this, was after I had wrote all I designed on that head.

The reader will observe, that the Greek words in the following discourse are all printed without their usual accents g. I do not think it needful to make any long apology for this; only would observe, that they are but a late appendage to the language, and not found in any manuscripts, which are a thousand years old. The original design of them was, to assist and direct in the pronunciation of the language; but it not being at all needful for us to pronounce it as the Grecians did, the accents are to us useless, and no more necessary in Greek than Latin.

g [In this edition the accents are preserved.]

THE

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.

THE design and principal authors of Gospel Harmonies. The design of the following treatise.

CHAP. II.

Mr. Whiston's proof considered. The question thereupon stated. Mr. Whiston's first argument, viz. that St. Matthew designed to observe the *order of time*, answered. St. Luke's words, chap. i. 1. do not prove that either of the Gospels we now receive were intended according to the order of time.

CHAP. III.

The writers of the Gospel-history did not intend or observe the *order of time* in their writings. This proved particularly of St. Luke, by several instances. The phrase *write in order*, Luc. i. 1. discussed.

CHAP. IV.

The practice of other historians, as well as the evangelists, to *neglect the order of time*. Several instances out of the Old Testament history. Instances out of profane authors. Several reasons why the evangelists neglect the *order of time*.

CHAP. V.

Mr. Whiston's second argument considered. It does not follow, that because St. Matthew, for the most part, observed the *order of time*, therefore he did in every particular. The third argument discussed; the notes of time Mr. Whiston mentions do not prove the *order of time*.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. Whiston's proof of the main proposition considered. It supposes *St. Mark's Gospel an epitome of St. Matthew's*. This the opinion of most learned men, but certainly false. That St. Mark

is not an epitome of St. Matthew, proved; first, from the account given in antiquity of the manner and occasion of his writing, viz. that he wrote at Rome, from St. Peter's mouth. The testimonies out of antiquity produced. Two observations from scripture to support these testimonies.

CHAP. VII.

The second argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel not to be an epitome of St. Matthew's; because *his accounts are generally larger, and contain many more particular circumstances, than St. Matthew's do.* This evidenced by several instances.

CHAP. VIII.

The third argument, by which it appears that St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. the remarkable disagreement there seems to be between these two evangelists, in several parts of their Gospels. It is first premised, that all these are reconcileable. Then the particular instances of their disagreement produced.

CHAP. IX.

The fourth argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. because it has a great many histories, which are not in St. Matthew. A catalogue of them. The fifth argument, viz. that it wants several remarkable histories.

CHAP. X.

The sixth argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. because *that supposition makes its inspiration more dubious and uncertain; it makes the author look like a plagiary.* Two objections against this argument answered. The seventh argument, the supposing this Gospel an epitome, *detracts from its honour and usefulness.* Spinoza and Father Simon for this reason assert most of the books of the Old Testament to be only epitomes made out of records that are lost. Lastly, supposing this Gospel an epitome invalidates in a great measure its testimony to the truth of Christianity. The evangelists did not see one another's Gospels.

CHAP. XI.

If it be allowed that St. Mark did epitomise St. Matthew, it will not follow that our present copies of St. Matthew are mis-

placed, and contrary to the order originally intended by the evangelist.

CHAP. XII.

The particular branches of St. Matthew's Gospel, which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced. Four propositions for the discovering the true *order of time* in the Gospel-history. Several of those branches, which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced, are so far from that, that they are in the exact *order of time* in which they came to pass. Instances of this produced.

CHAP. XIII.

None of those branches, which are *not according to the order of time*, in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel, are misplaced. This evidenced by considering several of them.

CHAP. XIV.

Mr. Whiston's method of accounting for the disorder he supposes in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel, viz. *that St. Matthew wrote it on small pieces of paper; that these were confusedly put together by those who did not perfectly understand the true series of the history.* Mr. Toinard of the same opinion. The improbability of it, proposed to be shewn from the ancient way of writing. The most ancient methods considered.

CHAP. XV.

That St. Matthew did not write his Gospel on small pieces of paper, proved by a large dissertation on the manner in which the ancients wrote their books. The ordinary method was to write upon large skins, which were fastened together and rolled up. This the practice of the Jews long before and in our Saviour's time. The words *opened* and *closed the book*, Luke iv. 17, 20. discussed. The words *bring the parchments*, 2 Tim. iv. 13. considered. It does not appear that the Jews made use of paper, or any other material besides that mentioned, to write their books upon.

CHAP. XVI.

Mr. Whiston's strange supposition of St. Matthew's writing this part of his Gospel on small pieces of paper, confuted from the consideration of their number and unequal size. A table of them, by which it appears that they were at least twenty in number, of very different sizes. Some contained several chapters,

others but a few verses, others but one verse. The improbability of St. Matthew's writing thus. The size of the parchment rolls on which the Jews wrote.

CHAP. XVII.

Mr. Whiston's observation, *that our present Greek copies of this Gospel are a translation out of Hebrew, and for that reason more liable to the disorder which he supposes*, considered. St. Matthew did not write his Gospel in Hebrew, though it is asserted by all the fathers. The fathers have frequently (one after another) fallen into the same mistake in matters of fact. How they came to fall into this mistake, viz. by taking the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites for the true authentic Gospel of St. Matthew. The fathers were under a sort of necessity of believing this mistake.

CHAP. XVIII.

The fathers fell into the mistake, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, because none of them, except Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius, understood that language. They were upon that account unable to compare the Gospel of the Nazarenes with their own Greek copies, and discover its spuriousness. This confirmed by a remark, *that none of the fathers, who assert St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, have cited the Gospel of the Nazarenes, except the three mentioned, who understood that language.* The reasons assigned, why they (Epiphanius, Jerome, and Origen) fell into the same mistake. Papias, the first Christian writer who asserts this, was a very fabulous and credulous person; yet was followed by many of the fathers in his mistakes (as Eusebius observes) by reason of his antiquity. His testimony in this matter proved by one part of it to be false.

CHAP. XIX.

Several arguments by which it appears probable that St. Matthew did not write his Gospel in Hebrew. The Greek was the most common language, and, for that reason, that Gospel was most likely to be useful therein. Supposing it a translation, makes its inspiration dubious. It is not probable that the original Hebrew would ever have been lost. The Hebrew one we have now is certainly a translation out of Greek.

CHAP. XX.

Though St. Matthew's Gospel be supposed a translation out of Hebrew, yet it was not, for that reason, more liable to dislocation or disorder.

CHAP. XXI.

Several arguments to prove that our present Greek copies of St. Matthew are not at all transposed or disordered since that evangelist's first writing. No book ever was thus disordered. It does not seem agreeable to the care which divine Providence always exercised towards the sacred books, to permit this to have happened to St. Matthew's Gospel. No other part of St. Matthew's Gospel disordered, and therefore not this. The dislocations, which Mr. Whiston supposes, could not happen to this Gospel in the apostles' time.

CHAP. XXII.

The disorder Mr. Whiston supposes in the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel could not possibly happen after the apostles' time, because of the great number of copies that were spread abroad in the world in their time. The time when St. Matthew wrote, and the distance between that time and St. John's death, considered. That the Gospels were very much dispersed in the apostles' time, largely proved. Mr. Hobbes, Mr. Toland, and Mr. Dodwell's notion *of the Gospels being a long while unknown and concealed,* confuted by several arguments.

CHAP. XXIII.

St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, was not disordered and misplaced since the apostles' time, because the Syriac version, which was made in the apostles' time, is in the same order with our present copies. An attempt to prove that the Syriac version was made in that time. Syriac was the language of the Jews in the apostles' time. Great numbers of Jews were converted to Christianity, and therefore needed a version in that language.

CHAP. XXIV.

The Syriac version, which we now have, is the same which was made in the apostles' time. This proved by three arguments. The Syrians, from whom we had it, believed it to be the same. It is improbable the ancient version should be lost; it wants the parts of the New Testament, which were last written.

A

VINDICATION

OF

THE FORMER PART

OF

ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL, &c.

CHAP. I.

The design and principal authors of Gospel Harmonies. The design of the following discourse.

THE difference which there is between the evangelists, in relating several circumstances of the Gospel-history, and particularly their disagreement as to *the order of time*, in which the things they relate were done, has in all ages of Christianity been objected as an argument against the truth of the history itself. Porphyry, Celsus, and many others, have for this reason reviled both the Gospels, and the religion which they contain. Hence it has been judged necessary by many pious and learned men, to employ themselves in endeavours to reconcile the seeming contradictions of these sacred writers, and to reduce the Gospels to a perfect harmony. Among the ancients, Tatian, the scholar of Justin Martyr, composed a Harmony in some part of the second century [a], and after him Ammonius of Alexandria, in the beginning of the third composed another, and after him Eusebius, in the beginning of the fourth [b]. In the last age great pains was taken in this work by Chemnitius, Gerhard, Calvin, Dr. Lightfoot, and many others. Mr. Le Clerc, Mr. Whiston, and Mr. Toinard, are (I think) the only

[a] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 4. c. 29.
[b] A specimen of which is to be seen in Sixt. Senens. Bib. Sanct. l. 3.

persons who have done any thing considerable in this matter of late years. To say nothing of the others, the world is exceedingly obliged to Mr. Whiston for the many curious and useful discoveries he has made in his performance on this subject; the propositions he has advanced, are certainly, for the most part, very ingenious and happy expedients to solve the difficulties they are designed for. There are however some of them that do not seem to be so very evident and so fully proved, as others; and in this number is that which I have now undertaken to discuss, viz. [c] *That the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, is very much misplaced, contrary to the method and order originally intended by the evangelist.*

That part of this Gospel which Mr. Whiston supposes disordered and misplaced, is from the middle of the *fourth*, to the end of the *thirteenth* chapter; in which small portion of the history there must have been, according to his supposition, at least twenty several disorders and misplacings.

However good Mr. Whiston's design might be in advancing so strange a proposition, I cannot but think he has failed in his proof of it. My business therefore in the following discourse will be, first, to shew the invalidity of Mr. Whiston's arguments, and then offer some reasons, by which it will appear that no such disorder can, without the greatest absurdity, be supposed to have happened to this, or any other part of this Gospel.

CHAP. II.

Mr. Whiston's proof considered. The question thereupon stated. Mr. Whiston's first argument, viz. that St. Matthew designed to observe the order of time, answered. St. Luke's words, chap. i. 1. *do not prove that either of the Gospels we now receive were intended according to the order of time.*

IN order to establish this *new* and *strange* proposition, (as Mr. Whiston himself calls it,) he undertakes to prove,

[c] Page 100.

1. *That St. Matthew appears originally to have observed the order of the time, through his whole Gospel, as well as the rest of the evangelists.* 2. *That from the fourth to the fourteenth chapter the several branches of St. Matthew's history are not according to the order of time.*

These two things, could they be sufficiently proved, do evidently demonstrate the truth of the proposition; for if St. Matthew wrote his Gospel according to the order of time, and it is not now according to that order, it is plain it is misplaced since it was first wrote. The latter of these two, viz. whether these branches of St. Matthew's Gospel are according to the order of time in our present copies, or not, I will not now dispute. It seems it was believed in the first ages, that St. Mark, and consequently St. Luke, (for it is certain that, for the most part, they observed the same order, and Mr. Whiston's Harmony evidently shews it,) did not follow that order. So we are informed by that very ancient account of Papias[d], viz. "That St. Mark, being the interpreter of St. Peter, very carefully wrote down all the things he could remember, but not "in that order in which the several things were said or done "by Christ." To the same purpose St. Jerome[e]. "That "St. Mark, the interpreter of St. Peter, who himself did not "see our Lord, but wrote the things which he had heard St. "Peter preach, was more concerned to be true in his account "of things, than to observe the order in which the things were "done." I might add here, that several more modern writers have been of the same opinion; and that St. Matthew's Gospel is more according to the order of time, than either St. Mark's or St. Luke's. But (as I said before) I will not dispute this head; and then the question between us will be only this, Whether St. Matthew appears originally to have observed the order of time through his whole Gospel.

Mr. Whiston, for the following reasons, asserts it, viz.

[d] Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσιν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέν τοι τάξει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, &c. Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.

[e] Marcus interpres apostoli Petri—qui Dominum quidem salvatorem ipse non vidit, sed ea, quæ audierat magistrum prædicantem, juxta fidem magis gestorum narravit, quam ordinem. Hieron. Præfat. in Comment. in Matth.

1. *Because all the other writers of the Gospel-history intended to observe this order.*

2. *St. Matthew, in the greatest part of his Gospel, does observe the* order of time *in his narrations.*

3. The notes *of the* order of time *are as many, and the same in that part which is now disordered, as in that which is regular, and in its proper order.*

1. *Mr. Whiston supposes, that all the other accounts of our Saviour's acts were intended according to this order.* For the proof of this he refers us to the first and third propositions, (which, by the way, seem to be very near the same, only differently expressed.) The principal proof in both places is taken from those words of St. Luke, chap. i. 1, 3. viz. *Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus.* "St. Luke," says Mr. Whiston [f], "assures us, not "only that himself had observed the *order of time*, but that "the same was intended by those many others who had writ-"ten the evangelical history before him." This indeed seems plausible, but will by no means prove that for which Mr. Whiston contends. For,

I. It is very probable, that St. Luke in these words had no reference to either of those Gospels which we now receive, but to some other accounts of our Saviour's life and acts, which were at that time wrote. As to St. John's Gospel, it is very certain he could not refer to that, because it was undoubtedly wrote a long time afterwards. Nor is it at all likely he had any respect to either of the other two Gospels which we now have, as will be apparent from a short consideration of St. Luke's words. The design of them evidently is, to give us an account of the *reasons* or *motives* which induced him to write his Gospel, viz. as he says, because many others had undertaken the like work before him. Now how the writing of others should be the *reason* or *occasion* of his writing, is very hard to conceive, unless we suppose some inaccuracies and de-

[f] Page 97.

fects in their writing. If the other accounts or histories he is supposed to refer to, were wrote as they ought to have been, this should have been so far from inclining him to write, that it should rather have prevented him, if he had had any such design. And therefore the histories or accounts, which St. Luke here refers to, were inaccurate and false. This is so very evident, that Mr. Whiston himself, in another place [g], has asserted the very same thing, where he thus paraphrases these words of St. Luke, viz. "That several of the histories of our "Saviour, which he (St. Luke) had perused, though they attempted it, were not able to arrive at a sufficient accuracy in "the order of time." St. Luke therefore, in these words, (even according to Mr. Whiston,) cannot respect either St. Matthew or St. Mark, because they both wrote very accurately, and, according to him, observed the order of time. I conclude therefore, that not the Gospels we now receive, but the other false Gospels, which were then wrote, were intended by St. Luke in these words: this opinion will appear yet much more probable, if we consider that there were, even at this time, a great number of *false* and *spurious* Gospels spread abroad in the world. Irenæus [h] tells us, that before his time the heretics had an "infinite number of spurious and apocryphal scriptures," which contained (as is plain from what he says afterwards) an account of our Saviour's life and acts. Men immediately upon the publishing of Christianity, formed themselves into various parties of different denominations; and many or most of these had their own Gospel, which was different from that of others. It would be endless, as well as needless, for me to mention the several Gospels of the Ebionites, Marcionites, Nazarenes, the Gospel of St. Peter, Andrew, James, Bartholomew, &c. Every one, who has in the least made Christian antiquity his study, is acquainted with these things; those that are not, may be fully satisfied in the matter, by a bare casting their eyes upon the authors cited at the bottom of the page [i], who have, especially

[g] Page 114.

[h] Ἀμύθητον πλῆθος ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν. Adv. Hæres. lib. 1. c. 17.

[i] Dr. Grabe's Spicileg. Patr. Fabric. Codex Apocryph. N. T. Sixt. Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. Father Simon's Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 3. Du Pin's Hist. of the Canon, vol. 2. c. 6. Toland's Catalogue in his Amyntor. Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. ad voc. Εὐαγγέλιον. Spanheim, Histor. Eccles. Christ. p. 582, &c.

some of them, made a very full collection of the *false* Gospels, which were spread abroad in the world, in the very infancy of Christianity. These were the οἱ πολλοὶ, *the many*, whom St. Luke referred to. I would only add here, that this hath been the opinion of many, if not most, ancient and modern writers. "St. Luke (says Austin [k]) gives us this reason for his writing "in order, because many others had attempted it; but we are "to understand him of such, who had no authority nor esteem "in the church, having undertaken what they were by no "means able to perform." To the same purpose says Eusebius. "[l] St. Luke, in the beginning of his Gospel, tells us what "was the occasion of his writing; intimating, that because "many others had rashly and inconsiderately undertaken to "write of those things, of which he had a full and certain "knowledge, he also would write to prevent the mischief of "those uncertain accounts." So Theophylact, in explaining these words [m], puts the question, "Who were those men, in-"tended by St. Luke, that took in hand to write," &c. and answers, "They were false apostles; for many such had wrote "Gospels." In the same opinion are the learned Erasmus [n], Grotius [o], Father Simon [p], Bellarmin [q], Calvin [r], all asserting St. Luke here had no regard to St. Matthew or St. Mark, but to some other writers, who had not wrote as they ought to do. The learned Mr. Dodwell carries the matter further, and (if I mistake not) does by a good argument conclude from these words of St. Luke, not only that he had no reference to either of these two Gospels, but that he never saw them. What he saith is to this purpose, viz. [s] "St. Luke, in the preface to his

[k] Ideo autem dicit sibi visum esse ex ordine diligenter scribere, quoniam multi conati sunt; sed eos debemus accipere, quorum in ecclesia nulla extat auctoritas, quia id, quod conati sunt, minime potuerunt implere. August. de Consens. Evangel. l. 4. c. 8.

[l] Ὁ δὲ Λουκᾶς ἀρχόμενος καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ κατ' αὐτὸν συγγράμματος, τὴν αἰτίαν προύθηκε, δι' ἣν πεποίηται τὴν σύνταξιν· δηλῶν, ὡς ἄρα πολλῶν καὶ ἄλλων προεπιβεβλημένων ἐπιτετηδευκότων διήγησιν ποιήσασθαι, &c. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24.

[m] Vid. eum ad Luc. i. 1.

[n] Annot. in N. T. ad Luc. i. 1.

[o] Annot. ad eund. loc.

[p] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 3.

[q] De Matrimon. Sacram. l. 1. c. 6.

[r] Harmon. Evangel. in init.

[s] Et cum novæ scriptionis edit in præfatione causam, quod ipse αὐτόπτων narrationibus adjutus fuerit aggressus, id plane innuit destitutos hoc subsidio fuisse visorum a se evangeliorum auctores, ita nimirum non fuisse αὐτόπτας, ut ne quidem αὐτόπτας cum cura aliqua et sedulitate consuluerint, vacillare proinde meritoque dubiam fuisse eorum fidem. Ut plane alios fuisse necesse est Evangelicæ historiæ scriptores a Luca visos, a nostris, quos habemus, evangelistis. Dissert. 1. in Iren. p. 68, 69.

" history, giving this reason for his writing, that he had re-
" ceived his accounts from those who were eyewitnesses, plainly
" intimates, that the writers of those other Gospels, which he
" had seen, were not furnished with that help; so that neither
" being eyewitnesses themselves, nor duly consulting such as
" were, their credit must be doubtful: and thence it must ne-
" cessarily follow, that the Gospels, which St. Luke had seen,
" were not any of those we now receive." Upon the whole, therefore, I hope I may justly say, that Mr. Whiston has here failed in his proof; because these words of St. Luke, having no reference to either of the Gospels we now receive, cannot prove what Mr. Whiston brings them for: that St. Matthew, or any of the Gospel writers, designed to observe the order of time in their histories. But,

II. If it should be allowed and taken for granted, that St. Luke in these words had respect to the Gospels we now receive, yet there is nothing in his words which will prove they were intended and wrote according to the order of time. Indeed, according to our English translation, one would be apt to think so; *Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration*, &c. From the words *to set forth in order*, Mr. Whiston concludes, that these Gospels, and particularly St. Matthew's, were wrote according to the order of time; but the original word ἀνατάξασθαι implies no such thing, but only in general to *compile*, or *compose*, or *set together*, without any particular regard to the order of time, or any other order whatsoever. This is the sense Suidas and Hesychius give of the word ἀνατάξασθαι [t]; and so it is taken by the old Syriac interpreter, and the best modern translators. So Beza [u], *componere narrationem*, and Castalio, *contexere narrationem;* De Dieu, *apparare seu concinnare;* so that the whole meaning is, *Forasmuch as many have undertaken to write the history*, &c. and consequently nothing can hence be concluded, concerning the evangelists designing to observe the *order of time* in their histories.

The three other arguments which Mr. Whiston offers, to

[t] Ἀνατάξασθαι, Εὐτρεπίσασθαι, i. e. apparare, instruere, componere, Εὐτρεπισμὸς, ἡ Ἑτοιμασία, Suid.

[u] Mihi vero τὸ συντάττεσθαι idem videtur generaliter declarare, atque conscribere, et conficere. Bez. ad loc.

prove the Gospels were wrote according to the order of time, p. 97, 98, 99. are so much the same, with those which are brought to prove this concerning St. Matthew in particular, that they need not be distinctly considered.

CHAP. III.

The writers of the Gospel-history did not intend or observe the order of time in their writings. This proved particularly of St. Luke by several instances. The phrase write in order, Luc. i. 3. *discussed.*

WHETHER the writers of the Gospel-history did design to relate the several acts and circumstances of our Saviour's life, according to that order of time in which each of them came to pass, is a question of very considerable importance. Mr. Whiston very earnestly contends for the affirmative [x]; which indeed if it be true, it is very certain, that not only that part of St. Matthew's Gospel, which he supposes, but also several parts of the other Gospels, are in our present copies very much misplaced, confused, and disordered. I rather think the evangelists had not any such regard to that order, but were principally concerned in relating the several matters of fact truly and faithfully. This has been the opinion of, I think, almost all those who have considered this matter, both ancient and later writers. "The truth is," says a learned writer, [y] "that the apostles" (he means all the evangelists) "had not properly any design in "writing, but to inform us of the doctrine and miracles of our "Lord; not much regarding those things which may be "thought requisite to an exact and methodical history." I do not suppose that the evangelists had no regard at all to the order of time, in composing their Gospels. The contrary is very certain; and a bare view of Mr. Whiston's Harmony will sufficiently convince any one, that, for the most part, each of these sacred writers not only intended to observe, but do exactly

[x] Prop. I.

[y] La vérité est, que les apôtres n'ont eu proprement dessein, que de nous apprendre la doctrine et les miracles de notre Seigneur, sans se mettre en peine de ce que l'on demande dans une histoire méthodique. Le Clerc Biblioth. choisie, tom. 15. art. 5. p. 251.

agree in observing this order. All that I contend for is, that they do not *always* confine themselves to this method, but very often for just and good reasons insert several particular transactions, not in that order in which they were done. This might be proved beyond doubt, of every one of the evangelists. But it will be sufficient to prove it only concerning St. Luke; because his Gospel is by Mr. Whiston supposed to be perfectly in this order of time, and therefore he corrects St. Matthew's by it. The following instances will abundantly evidence the truth of what I say.

St. Luke, ch. iii. ver. 19, 20. relates the history of *John's imprisonment by Herod*, before the account of *our Saviour's baptism*, ver. 21, &c. which certainly is contrary to the order of time; Christ being no doubt baptized long before *John's imprisonment;* see Matt. iii. 13, &c. and iv. 12. Hence Mr. Whiston himself has taken the liberty here to transpose these verses in his Harmony, although he tells us, (p. 100.) that he had ventured but in one instance (viz. that of our Lord's mother and brethren coming to him) to change the order of St. Luke.

Ch. iv. 33, &c. St. Luke relates the *history of the unclean spirit being cast out of the man, in the synagogue at Capernaum*, and ver. 38, &c. *the account of Peter's mother-in-law being cured of a fever*, and after these, ch. v. 1. *the calling of Peter and the other apostles by the sea-side;* whereas it is very certain, that these apostles were called before these miracles. And so this history ought, if the order of time had been observed, to have been placed sooner, as both the other evangelists have placed it, Matt. iv. 18, &c. compared with ch. viii. 2, &c. and 14, &c. and Mark i. 16, 30. This is so undeniable a proof of St. Luke's sometimes leaving the order of time, that nothing can reasonably be urged or objected against it. Indeed Mr. Whiston, finding this so directly overthrowing his scheme which he had before formed, was resolved to say something against it, and therefore he supposes[z], that *the history here recorded by St. Luke is quite different from that recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark.* But I cannot think any one, who con-

[z] Page 123. and 125.

siders the matter without prejudice, can be of that opinion. The circumstances are so very like, that I believe every one that reads those two histories, concludes them to be the same. I own indeed there are some different circumstances in the histories, and so there are in almost every one of the stories which are related by two evangelists. But those here are very inconsiderable, and very easily to be reconciled. Mr. Whiston however has made them so many arguments to prove the story in St. Matthew and St. Mark, and that in St. Luke to be different. I need not be at the pains distinctly to consider them; Dr. Whitby[a] has in a few words sufficiently shewed, that they do not prove the two different *callings* of these apostles, which Mr. Whiston contends for. The four first reasons, by which Mr. Whiston endeavours to prove these two stories different, are only *additional circumstances*, mentioned by St. Luke, and not by St. Matthew nor St. Mark. The other two are really not different at all. A bare casting the eye upon them will evidently shew it:

St. Matthew and St. Mark.	St. Luke.
Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men.	*From henceforth thou shalt catch men.*
They left their nets, and followed him.	*They left all, and followed him.*

Are these such *differences*, as to prove the histories to be different? One would rather think these very circumstances to be the same; and if so, it is plain that St. Luke did not always design to observe the order of time in his history.

Another instance to the same purpose (viz. of St. Luke's not observing the order of time in the stories which he relates) we have, ch. viii. 19, 20, 21. where he places the history *of our Lord's mother and brethren*, *after the parable of the sower*, which begins at ver. 4. of that chapter, but according to the other evangelists, viz. St. Matthew and St. Mark, it is evident this account should have been before this parable, if the order of time had been observed; see Matt. xii. 46, &c. and xiii. 1, &c. and Mark iii. 31, &c. and iv. 1, &c. Hence Mr. Whiston

[a] Annot. on Matt. iv. 18. vid. et Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. 3. Dub. 72.

has in this instance also receded from St. Luke's order in his Harmony [b].

These, were there no other, seem to be sufficient arguments to prove, that St. Luke did not confine himself always strictly to relate the acts and circumstances of our Saviour's life, in the same order in which they came to pass. That which induced Mr. Whiston [c], as well as many others, to the contrary opinion, are those words in St. Luke's preface, ch. i. ver. 3. where he says, he designed, καθεξῆς γράψαι, *to write in order*. But to this it may be answered, that it is not at all necessary this word should be thus translated; it may be as well rendered *particularly*, *serie perpetua;* so it is certain the word commonly signifies, and the best critics have taken it in this sense. "They "are mistaken," says Grotius [d], "who conclude from this word, "that St. Luke designed more closely to observe the order of "time than the others had done before him; for on the con- "trary it is evident, that he more than once relates things of "the same nature together, though they were done at different "times. Καθεξῆς means nothing more than *particularly*, as is "plain from the use of the word Acts xi. 4. and xviii. 23." So that St. Luke's meaning here is no more than this, *My design is to write to thee a* particular *account of the things done by Christ*. But if after all καθεξῆς γράψαι should be translated to *write in order*, why must it needs regard the order of time more than any other order? Are there not several other orders and methods of writing made use of by historians besides this? viz. such as placing actions and discourses of a like nature together, or things which were done at the *same place*, though not at the *same time*. An historian may be very properly said to write in order, who does not exactly observe the order of time.

But if we suppose further, that St. Luke by the word καθεξῆς did intend the order of time, why must he be supposed to limit and confine himself to it in every particular branch of his his-

[b] P. 287. and 289.

[c] P. 97. and 114.

[d] Falluntur, qui hinc colligunt propositum Lucæ *temporum ordinem* pressius sequi, quam alii ante ipsum fecissent; nam contra apparet, illum non semel ob rerum cohærentiam connexuisse, quæ temporibus erant discreta. Sed καθεξῆς, nil aliud est quam *sigillatim*, ut videre est Act. xi. 4. et xviii. 23. Grot. ad Luc. i. 3.

tory, so that he could not, when he saw a just occasion, recede from it? He may be well said to write in the order of time, who doth so for the most part. And hence it is excellently observed by our late English critic[e], that, "it being certain "that St. Luke in his Gospel doth not give us Christ's mira- "cles, sermons, and journeys, in that order of time in which "they were done and spoken; it remains, that, when he pro- "mised to write καθεξῆς, *in order*, we understand this of Christ's "conception, birth, circumcision, baptism, preaching, death, "resurrection, and ascension, of which he truly writes in or- "der." Upon the whole, then, I conclude, that St. Luke in writing his Gospel did not design exactly to observe the order of time, and consequently also, that St. Mark did not; because, according to Mr. Whiston[f], he every where agrees with St. Luke: and so Mr. Whiston's argument, to prove St. Matthew originally observed the order of time, viz. *because other Gospel writers did so*, is plainly insufficient.

CHAP. IV.

The practice of other historians, as well as the evangelists, to neglect the order of time. Several instances out of the Old Testament history. Instances out of profane authors. Several reasons why the evangelists neglect the order of time.

HOWEVER strange it may seem to some, that these sacred writers should thus disregard the order of time, and consequently differ so much from each other; yet this will not at all derogate from their honour and authority, if the matter be duly and impartially considered. For as this is very often, upon many accounts, undoubtedly the best way of writing history, so it has been the practice of the best historians, both sacred and profane, in all ages and countries. Mr. Whiston indeed tells us, that those who do not take his method, and suppose St. Matthew's Gospel in our present copies misplaced, "are forced on another method, which plainly implies the fre- "quent inaccuracy, if not falsehood, of the inspired writers "themselves[g]." This is a very hard charge indeed, which at

[e] Dr. Whitby, Annot. on Luc. i. 3. [f] P. 114. [g] P. 112.

once falls upon all the harmonizers and commentators of the Gospels, that ever wrote before Mr. Whiston. It is strange that all these good men, who had so great a veneration for inspired writers, should thus charge the evangelists with *inaccuracies*, if not *falsehood;* Mr. Whiston will agree with me, they had none of them this design, and then I am not afraid to assert, that no such thing follows from *the method they took to reconcile the evangelists.*

The substance of their charge amounts to no more than this, viz. That they suppose the evangelists not to have *always*, and *in every particular instance*, observed the order of time; but this is so far from supposing an *inaccuracy* or *falsehood* in the evangelists, that it is only supposing them to have taken the best method, and the method the best historians have taken, before and since their time.

For the clearing of this matter I will endeavour to shew,

I. *That this is a thing very common in the history of the Old Testament.*

II. *That it has been the practice of the best profane historians.*

III. *Offer some reasons, why the evangelists neglected the* order of time.

I. *The writers of the history of the Old Testament very frequently deviate from the order of time, in relating several branches of their history; sometimes placing them much* sooner, *sometimes much* later, *than the time in which they really came to pass.* This was very remarkably the practice of that best and most accurate of all historians, Moses. For instance,

Gen. xxv. 7, 8, 9. He places the *death of Abraham* before the birth of Isaac's two sons, Esau and Jacob, ver. 24, 25. &c. whereas it is very certain that Abraham was alive when they were born, and lived at least *fifteen years* afterwards, as will appear by the following account.

Abraham was a *hundred years* old when his son Isaac was born, Gen. xxi. 5. Isaac was *threescore years* old when his sons Esau and Jacob were born, ch. xxv. 26. therefore Abraham was but a *hundred and threescore* at their birth. But Abraham lived till he was a hundred and seventy-five, ch. xxv. 7.

and therefore it is evident that the death of Abraham is placed at least fifteen years too soon, being placed before the birth of Esau and Jacob; whereas if the order of time had been observed, it must have been placed at least fifteen years afterwards.

The same may be observed also concerning the historian's placing his account of the death of Isaac, Gen. xxxv. 28, 29. It is placed *before the selling of Joseph into Egypt by his brethren*, ch. xxxvii. whereas, if the order of time had been observed, it ought to have been placed *after;* it being certain that Isaac lived at least *twelve years* after that time, as will appear by the following account.

Joseph was *thirty years* old when he was advanced by Pharaoh in Egypt, Gen. xli. 46. After this there came *seven years of plenty*, ver. 47, 53. and *two years of famine*, before Jacob came down to Egypt, ch. xlv. 6. so that Joseph was at least *thirty-nine years* old when Jacob his father came down to Egypt; Jacob, when he came down to Egypt, was a *hundred and thirty years* old, ch. xlvii. 9. Now from the time of Joseph's being sold by his brethren till this time, (viz. till his thirty-ninth year,) were *twenty-two* years, because he was sold in his *seventeenth* year, ch. xxxvii. 2. If then we take the *twenty-two* years which Joseph was in Egypt, from the *hundred and thirty* of Jacob, it is plain that Jacob was a *hundred and eight* when Joseph was *seventeen*, and consequently, when Joseph was sold to Egypt, Isaac was no more than *a hundred and sixty-eight;* for Jacob (who was at this time but *a hundred and eight*) was born when Isaac was *sixty years* old, ch. xxv. 26. Now Isaac lived till he was *a hundred and eighty years old*, ch. xxxv. 28. and consequently *twelve years* after Joseph was sold into Egypt. So that it is evident the account of Isaac's death is not placed according to the order of time, but at least twelve years sooner than that order required.

Another very remarkable instance to the same purpose, viz. of the author of the book of Genesis not observing the order of time in his history, we have ch. xxxviii. The several matters there related are placed between the account of *Joseph's being sold into Egypt*, and *his advancement before Pharaoh*. This interval, or space of time, consists of no more than thirteen

years; for Joseph was sold in his seventeenth, and advanced in his thirtieth year. Now upon a close consideration of the circumstances of the history, it will appear morally impossible that all the several matters related in that chapter should have come to pass in that time, as will be evident by just naming them.

First, Judah leaves his father's family, and marries, and successively begat three sons, Er, Onan, and Shelah. When the eldest came to age, he married Tamar; some time after the Lord slew him, and Onan the second brother married his widow; after his death she continued a considerable time a widow, expecting the time when the third son would be grown up and marry her. He grows up, but refuses to marry her; therefore she plays the harlot with her father-in-law Judah, and by him she hath two sons. And all this must have been in less than the space of thirteen years, unless we suppose the historian not to have observed the order of time; which certainly he did not, a great part of what is here related having undoubtedly come to pass a considerable time before Joseph was sold into Egypt[h].

These are instances sufficient to prove, that though the evangelists did not always confine themselves to observe the order of time, yet they had the example of the best historian in the world to justify their practice in neglecting it.

Nor was this only the practice of Moses, but of most, if not all, the writers of the sacred history of the Old Testament. There is a noted example of this in the book of Judges, *the last five chapters* of which history ought, if the order of time had been observed, to have been placed near the beginning of it. The story of *Micah's idolatry*, and *the expedition of the tribe of Dan*, ch. xvii. and xviii. *of the Levite's concubine, and the war on her account*, ch. xix. xx. and xxi. are each of them placed above two hundred years too late, which is easy enough to be proved. Hence Josephus has placed the *history of the three last chapters* before *the history of the Judges*[i], and the

[h] Quomodo ergo hæc omnia intra tam paucos annos fieri potuerint, merito movet; nisi, ut forte solet, scriptura per recapitulationem, aliquot annos ante venditum Joseph, hoc fieri cœpisse intelligi velit, &c. August. Quæst. Sup. Gen. l. 1. c. 128.

[i] Antiq. Jud. lib. 5. c. 2.

old Hebrew chronologer [k] has placed *the story of Micah*, and *the tribe of Dan's idolatry*, and *the story of the Levite's concubine* in the time of Othniel, the first of the Judges; and, as far as I can find, most chronologers and commentators are of the same mind [l].

The story of *Shimei's death*, 1 Kings ii. 39. &c. is evidently placed three years too soon in the history.

Abundance of other such instances might be collected out of the historical books, were it necessary. Those that have a mind to see them may consult Dr. Lightfoot [m] and Usher [n], &c. I would only add, that this has been a very ancient and common observation; and that for this purpose the famous sixth rule of Ticonius [o], called *recapitulatio*, was invented. But,

II. This is not a practice peculiar to the sacred writers, *but made use of by all historians.* The most accurate and exact among those who are called profane writers have taken this liberty in composing their histories. Livy, Plutarch, Tacitus, Suetonius, Florus, &c. have all upon particular occasions neglected the exact order of time. Suetonius, for instance, is very frequent in this practice; continually laying matters of a like nature together, without regard to the order of time in which they were done. In the Life of Augustus he expressly tells us, it was his design to do so [p]: "not to confine himself "to strict chronology, or the order of time in which the se- "veral things were done; but instead of being punctual to the "time, join actions of a like nature together, that so they "might be more clearly perceived and known." This any one who reads his memoirs of Augustus's life will perceive he has done, just as St. Matthew and the other evangelists, in writing the memoirs of our Saviour's life.

[k] Seder Olam Rabba, c. 20. p. 50.

[l] Dr. Lightfoot Chronic. and Harmon. of the Old Test. on Judges, &c. Usher Chronol. Sacr. p. 199. Petav. Rationar. Temp. l. 1. c. 6. Junius ad Jud. 17. 1. Spanheim. Hist. Eccl. V. T. Epoch. 4. c. 10.

[m] Lib. jam cit.

[n] Chronol. Sacr.

[o] Apud August. de Doct. Christ. l. 3. c. 36.

[p] Proposita vitæ ejus velut summa, partes sigillatim, neque per tempora, sed per species, exsequar; quo distinctius demonstrari cognoscique possint. Suetonius in August. c. 9.

Sic solent scriptores—*per species exsequi*, i. e. secundum actiones et genera, narrare statum et conditionem vitæ. Sic cum narramus, quæ quis publice, quæ privatim, quæ fortiter, quæ moderate, quæ serio, quæ jocose

To the same purpose Lucius Florus [q] intimates, "That "he would not observe the strict order of time; but that "the things he should relate might the better appear, he "would relate them distinctly and separately," &c. If then other writers, sacred and profane, have so very frequently neglected this order, we need not be surprised that St. Matthew and the other evangelists have done so too; especially when we consider, that it is only in a few instances that they have done it, and then *for the most part*, if not *always*, some good reason may be assigned why they have done so. This leads me,

III. To consider, *Why, and for what reasons, the evangelists receded from the order of time in their histories.*

I shall not be at the pains to consider all the several branches of their histories in which this order is neglected, and shew the *particular occasions* why they are placed as they are; all that I design, is to mention some general *causes or occasions* of their relating things in a different order from that in which they were done, and particularly,

1. *Sometimes the evangelists relate those facts together, which were done at a different time, because they were done in the same place.* It seemed a very good expedient to assist the memory, sometimes to relate the several miracles our Saviour wrought at one place together, though they were done at different times. So, *the healing of the leprous person, the cure of the centurion's servant, the recovering of Peter's mother-in-law*, are placed immediately one after another by St. Matthew, ch. viii. from ver. 2, to the 16th, because each of these miracles was wrought at Capernaum, though at different times. "Hence," says Dr. Lightfoot, "the mention of a place doth "oftentimes occasion these holy penmen to speak of stories "out of their proper time, because they would take up the "whole story of that place all at once, or together [r]." For this reason it is that St. Luke places the history of *the unclean spirit being cast out of the man in the synagogue at Ca-*

egerit, non observato annorum ordine. Pitisc. ad Loc.

[q] Quæ etsi involuta inter se sunt omnia atque confusa, tamen, quo melius appareant, simul et ne scelera virtutibus obstrepant, separatim proferentur, &c. L. Flor. lib. 2. c. 19.

[r] Lightfoot, Harmon. of the New Test. §. 20.

pernaum, ch. iv. 33. &c. and the account of *Peter's mother-in-law being cured of a fever*, ver. 39, &c. before *the call of the apostles by the sea-side*, ch. v. 1. (which has been proved [s] to be contrary to the order of time;) viz. because having mentioned our Lord's being and preaching at Capernaum (ver. 31.) he had a mind to record together the miracles our Lord did there, though done at another time.

2. Another reason why the evangelists sometimes place a fact out of its proper order of time is, *because they having been speaking of the person concerned in it before, had a mind there to finish all they designed to say of him.* So, for instance, the story of John the Baptist's being imprisoned by Herod, Luke iii. 19, 20. (which has been proved not to be in the order of time) was placed where it is, because the evangelist, having before been giving an account of John's ministry, and not designing to say much more of him, had a mind here to finish his whole story together. This is so far from being any fault in a history, that it is really oftentimes the best and most accurate way of writing it; because by a strict and constant adherence to the order of time, there must necessarily be *continual breaches* and *frequent interruptions* in the history. Stories must be often brought in without any connection or coherence, and consequently are not so like to be remembered [t]. It may therefore be sometimes much better that the whole story of a person or thing be told together, though some other things intervene which are told afterwards. For this reason, we may observe, the inspired penman of the book of Genesis has placed the death of Isaac (ch. xxxv. 28, 29.) so much too soon, as it has been above proved to be [u], viz. because having, ver. 27. given an account of his son Jacob's coming to him to Hebron, and designing to say no more concerning his life, but to proceed to the history of his posterity; it seemed very proper there to mention his death, that he might not be forced elsewhere to bring it in, by any breach or interruption in his history [x]. For the same reason also is the

[s] P. 30.

[t] Facilius cujusque rei in unum contracta species, quam divisa temporibus, oculis animisque inhæret. Vellei. Paterc. 1. 14.

[u] P. 36.

[x] Constat ante mortem Isaaci venditum fuisse Josephum, cum tamen hanc historiam (sc. Josephi) Moses post obitum et sepulturam recitet: ut necessario concedenda sit hysterologia, cujus ratio hæc fuit; quia post adven-

story of Shimei's death placed too soon, 1 Kings ii. 39. that the whole story of him might be finished at once, and not brought in without any connection, as it must necessarily have been, if it had been placed afterwards.

3. It is not at all absurd or unreasonable to suppose, *that divine wisdom ordered it to be thus, to prevent all suspicion of the evangelists' writing in concert, or by combination, with design to impose upon the world.* Christianity was looked upon at first, by many, as a delusion, and the authors of these sacred books as cheats and impostors. Against this the Christians commonly argued, that, if the writers of the Gospel-history had had any such designs, they would not have so many things which seem contrary to each other. The reasoning of Chrysostom on this head is so very just, that it well deserves transcribing [y]. He brings in a person making this objection, that the *evangelists do not agree in their accounts.* To this he answers; "Their not agreeing in every particular is a full "demonstration of their truth; for if they had in all things "agreed with a perfect exactness, both as to time, and place, "and words, none of our adversaries but would have believed "that they met together, and wrote by compact and consent to "deceive: but now that difference there seems to be between "them in these smaller matters defends them from all such "suspicion," &c. Such arguing seems to be very just; and if it be, what is there absurd in supposing that divine wisdom ordered these little differences, those in respect of time among others, for this good end? "The Holy Spirit," says a learned man, "influenced the evangelists to write many things in a dif-"ferent order, that they might not seem to have wrote by com-"pact, or to have borrowed one from another [z]."

tum Jacobi in Hebron, nihil amplius de vita Isaaci vellet narrare Moses, et ad ea, quæ de Jacobo patriarcha notanda acciderent, pergere deliberasset, historiam Isaaci operæ pretium judicavit concludere per mortem ipsius, &c. Rivet. Exercit. 144. Gen.

[y] Πολλαχοῦ γὰρ διαφωνοῦντες ἐλέγχονται. Αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο μέγιστον δεῖγμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἐστίν. Εἰ γὰρ πάντα συνεφώνησαν μετὰ ἀκριβείας, καὶ μέχρι καιροῦ, καὶ μέχρι τόπου, καὶ μέχρι ῥημάτων αὐτῶν, οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐπίστευσεν ὅτι μὴ συνελθόντες ἀπὸ συνθήκης τινὸς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔγραψαν—Νυνὶ δὲ καὶ ἡ δοκοῦσα ἐν μικροῖς εἶναι διαφωνία πάσης ἀπαλλάττει αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, &c. Chrysostom. Homil. in Matth. i. Idem vid. apud Theophylact. Præfat. in Matth.

[z] Voluit vero Spiritus Sanctus diverso ordine multa ab evangelistis narrari;—ne vel ex compacto, vel collatis capitibus, scripsisse, vel sua a se invicem descripsisse viderentur, &c. Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. 3. Dub. 69.

4. Mr. Whiston has furnished me with another reason, why the evangelists are thus different from one another, and do not observe the same order in relating the several acts of our Saviour's life. "It ought not," says he, "[a] to seem strange, if that "book, which contains the revealed will of God, be so framed "as to have divers seeming contradictions in it, for the per- "plexing the ungodly, and the exercise of the pious." This observation of Mr. Whiston's is what several other learned men have upon this and other occasions made [b], and is, if true, a very good reason why the evangelists were not so very exact in observing the order of time in their histories.

Thus I have endeavoured to justify the practice of the evangelists, in relating things in a different order from that in which they came to pass, both by shewing it was the practice of the best historians, and by several other reasons. I only add, that, as it has been already proved concerning St. Luke[c], *that he did not tell us* he designed to observe the exact order of time, so it is certain *no one of the evangelists has told us so;* and if they did not engage and promise to observe this order, certainly they are not to be accused of falsehood in not observing it. Hence the learned Dr. Hammond [d] well observed, "that all these, and (if there were) many more [*dif-* "*ferences*] do nothing derogate from the fidelity of the writ- "ers; who, undertaking to make some relations of what was "done by Christ, do nowhere undertake, nor oblige them- "selves, to observe the order wherein every thing succeeded, "that being generally extrinsical, and of no importance to the "relations."

And to the same purpose it is well remarked by the author just now cited[e], "that no one can charge that writer with a "falsehood or contradiction, for relating things in a different "order from that in which they came to pass, if he did not "beforehand engage to observe that order." The principal

[a] Chronolog. of the Old Test. p. 3.

[b] Multa diverso ordine ab evangelistis narrari voluit Spiritus Sanctus, exercendæ et subigendæ fidei nostræ, &c. causa Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. 3. Dub. 69.

[c] P. 24, &c.

[d] Annot. on Mark v. 2.

[e] Immo nemo mendacii vel contradictionis insimulaverit illum, qui eadem diverso ordine recitat, modo non præfertur se ordinem relaturum, æque ac res ipsas. Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. 3. Dub. 56.

thing these sacred writers were concerned about was *truth*, to be faithful and just in the accounts they gave us; and this indeed is the most necessary requisite and best character of an historian. Hence Lucian, in his excellent directions for writing history, tells us[f], "the one thing most peculiarly requisite "to history is *truth*. If any go about to write a history, he "must principally regard truth, not concerning himself about "any thing else."

CHAP. V.

Mr. Whiston's second argument considered. It does not follow that because St. Matthew for the most part observed the order of time, therefore he did in every particular. The third argument discussed. The notes of time Mr. Whiston mentions do not prove the order of time.

THE second argument which Mr. Whiston makes use of to prove that St. Matthew originally observed the order of time through his whole Gospel is, *because he does so in the greatest part of his Gospel.* After what hath been said in the two former chapters, there seems very little necessary to be said in answer to this. I agree with Mr. Whiston, that St. Matthew (and so indeed each of the other evangelists) does for the most part exactly observe the order of time; yet it will by no means follow, that that inspired writer was always so confined to a strict observance of this order, that he could upon no occasions whatsoever depart from it. Several reasons have been assigned, upon the account of which an historian may sometimes deviate from this order, though for the most part he strictly observe it. And it has been proved that St. Luke sometimes relates things in a different order from that in which they came to pass, though for the most part he exactly observes the order of time. Mr. Whiston's argument therefore, that because St.

[f] Ἐν γὰρ τοῦτο (scil. ἀλήθεια) ἴδιον ἱστορίας, καὶ μόνῃ θυτέον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, εἴ τις ἱστορίαν γράψων ἴοι, τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἁπάντων ἀμελητέον αὐτῷ, &c. Lucian. de Conscrib. Histor. §. 39. Historicus itaque, si ad verum et fidem de re proposita retulerit, officio suo satisfecisse existimabitur. Isaac. Pontan. Orat. Isagog. ad L. Flor. p. 1.

Matthew for the most part writes in this order, therefore he does never recede from it, will not hold.

Mr. Whiston's last argument, by which he endeavours to prove that St. Matthew originally observed the order of time through his whole Gospel, is, that "the notes of the order of "time, and coherence of parts, are as many in that part which "is now disordered and misplaced, as in that which is regular "and in its proper order." It is true indeed, those which Mr. Whiston has here collected, and calls "notes of the order of "time," are as frequent in this as any other part of the Gospel; but then these are such which are only (if they may be so called) *notes of transition*, generally inserted by the historian *only for the sake of connecting the several stories together, and not to denote the regular succession of the facts related.* They are most of them such as can only relate to the story that follows them, and do not at all connect it with that foregoing. This will appear by a very slight consideration of them: they are such as these; Ἰδὼν δέ· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ· καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους· καὶ ἰδού· εἰσελθόντι δέ· καὶ ἐλθών· καὶ προσελθών· &c. *and seeing; and opening his mouth; and coming down from the mountain; and behold; and as he was entering; and coming*, &c. Is it not evident that these, and such as these, are designed only for the better transition from one story to another? Is it not very plain that they regard only the subsequent story? For instance; Ἰδὼν δέ· καὶ Ἰδού· *and when Jesus saw; and behold;* have these phrases any reference at all to what goes before? do they intimate that the next fact related was immediately in order of time after that which was before related? Let us suppose the story to which one of these notes is prefixed, a considerable time after that which immediately precedes it in the history, might not the historian very properly prefix one of these notes to it? Might he not say, καὶ ἰδών, or καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, *and Jesus seeing*, or *coming*, did such or such a thing, only regarding what he was about to tell, without the least respect to what he had said before? Nay, let us go further, and suppose one of those notes prefixed to a story, which in the order of time was before that which it immediately succeeds, yet would the pre-

fixing of such a note be very proper. For instance, to the sermon on the Mount (Matt. v. 2.) is prefixed καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, (which is one of Mr. Whiston's notes of the order of time,) *and he opened his mouth.* Might not this note be very well prefixed to our Saviour's preaching, although the sermon, in the order of time, were really before that which immediately precedes it in the history? The same may be proved of almost every one of these notes, which Mr. Whiston has here mentioned, if it were necessary.

The truth is, it is a common thing in all histories to make use of such *transitory* or *introductory* phrases as these; nay even of those which seem most to imply an immediate and orderly succession of events, *in a very great latitude.* So for instance, Gen. xxxviii. 1. immediately after the account of Joseph's being sold into Egypt, it follows, *at that time Judah went down from his brethren*, &c. when as it is certain this happened a *considerable time before Joseph's being sold into Egypt*[g]. Hence, says Dr. Lightfoot[h], "the words *at that* "*time* are not to be referred to the next words going before in "the preceding chapter, concerning Joseph's sale to Potiphar, "but are of *a more large extent;* as that phrase, and the phrase "*in those days*, are oft in scripture." It is a trite observation among the writers of sacred chronology, that these phrases in scripture are frequently used with a great deal of latitude. It has been observed that this phrase, *In that day or time*, is used *sixteen* times in the Old and New Testament in a lax sense, and not implying a regular succession of events[i]. So the words Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, Matt. iii. 1. are put to introduce the history, which is next to Christ's fixing at Nazareth; which was about thirty years after. Upon the whole then, if this be the use of most of these notes, only to introduce the following story, if those which seem most to be notes of time re-

[g] See above, p. 148, 149.

[h] Harmon. and Chronic. of the Old Test. Gen. chap. xxxviii.

[i] Locutionem autem illam (*in tempore illo*) eodem modo in Deuter. x. 8. usurpari notat Aben-Ezra; quomodo et ab aliis est observatum, *in die illo*, sine determinata aliqua temporis notatione, sedecies in Veteri et Novo Testamento esse positum: hocque ipso in loco, *in tempore illo*, non ad illud, quo in Egyptum venditus est Josephus, sed quo ipse Judas in Cananæam cum Patre advenit, referendum esse defendimus. Usser. Chronol. Sacr. c. 10. Vid. Spanheim. Dub. Evang. tom. 2. Dub. 10. et 95.

gard principally what follows, and are used in such a lax sense; then they do not prove that this part of St. Matthew's Gospel was originally wrote according to the order of time.

Thus I have considered Mr. Whiston's first assertion, viz. *That St. Matthew designed originally to observe the order of time through his whole Gospel*, and have endeavoured to shew that the several arguments he brings to support it are not conclusive.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. Whiston's proof of the main proposition considered. It supposes St. Mark's Gospel an epitome of St. Matthew's. This the opinion of most learned men, but certainly false. That St. Mark is not an epitome of St. Matthew, proved, first, from the account given in antiquity of the manner and occasion of his writing, viz. that he wrote at Rome from St. Peter's mouth. The testimonies out of antiquity produced. Two observations from scripture to support these testimonies.

MR. WHISTON having attempted to prove that St. Matthew, in this part of his Gospel, designed to observe the order of time, proceeds to shew *that the several branches of the history in this part are not according to the order of time.* But before he comes to a particular proof of this, he says, "He will "in general prove the main proposition by the most authentic "evidence, viz. the testimony of St. Mark [k]." This indeed, if it be any evidence at all, will be most authentic and indisputable. Let us a little consider it.

"St. Mark," says Mr. Whiston, "was the epitomizer of St. "Matthew—gives us such an account of our Saviour's acts, "as demonstrates that St. Matthew's Gospel lay then before "him, and was the almost only guide he followed in his his-"tory. Now supposing this," says he, "it will follow, that "either that copy of St. Matthew, which St. Mark made use "of, was in a different order from that which we now have, (in "the chapters under consideration,) or else that he knew the

[k] Page 102.

" order of his copy to be wrong, and contrary to the original " one, and so reduced it in his epitome to the true and regular " series of events, which he learned from St. Peter. Now " either of these is sufficient for my present purpose; for it is " evident that St. Mark does not observe the order of the pre- " sent copies of St. Matthew (whom he epitomizes) in that " part we are speaking of," &c. This now is St. Mark's testimony, and Mr. Whiston's *most convincing argument*, of the truth of the proposition, viz. *that the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, is not now in its true and first intended order.*

However specious and plausible this argument may at first appear, I doubt not but every unbiassed mind, after a more close examination, will be very far from thinking it conclusive and convincing. The two following considerations will sufficiently invalidate the force of this reasoning, viz.

I. *St. Mark did not epitomize or abridge St. Matthew's Gospel, nor had he it lying before him when he wrote.*

II. *Suppose St. Mark did abridge and make use of St. Matthew's Gospel in composing his, yet it will not follow either that the copies he then used were, or our present copies now, are misplaced, and out of the order originally intended by St. Matthew.*

I. *St. Mark did not epitomize or abridge St. Matthew's Gospel, nor had he it lying before him when he wrote.* In undertaking to prove this, I am very well aware that I oppose the sentiments of learned men in all ages of the church: ancient and modern writers have almost all, with one common consent, voted and agreed St. Mark's Gospel to be an epitome of St. Matthew's.

Austin [l], among the ancients, and among later writers Erasmus [m], Sixtus Senensis [n], Alsted [o], Grotius [p], Spanheim [q], Toinard [r], and many others, assert it. Nay, Erasmus [s] in another

[l] Marcus Matthæum subsecutus tanquam pedissequus et breviator ejus videtur. Aug. de Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. 2.

[m] Annot. in Nov. Test. ad Marc. i. 1.

[n] Biblioth. Sanct. l. 1. ad voc. Marc.

[o] Præcognit. Theolog. l. 2. p. 263.

[p] Annot. ad Marc. i. 1.

[q] Histor. Eccles. Sæcul. 1. c. 6.

[r] Prolegom. in Harm. Evang. p. 4.

[s] Erasmus, in Apolog. contra Albertum Carporum Principem, scribit, eundem fuisse utriusque evangelii scriptorem. Vid. Sixt. Senens. l. 7. de Marci evangelio.

place has carried the matter somewhat further, and by a certain likeness, which he imagined he observed in the style and idiom of these two Gospels, (contrary to all antiquity, and even to himself in the place first cited), is induced to believe *they both were wrote by the same person.*

But notwithstanding this so universal agreement of learned men in this matter, I am not afraid to undertake the defence of the contrary opinion. It is no new or uncommon thing for the bulk of critics and commentators to agree in an error. An opinion that is plausible, and has some appearance of probability, first started by a person of reputation, and ushered into the world under some great name, is very often universally received, and for a long time entertained as an unquestionable truth, though all the while it be really false: but if in process of time it has the good fortune to be espoused by more men of reputation and character, for sense and learning, it then acquires a sort of sanctity, and, through I know not what sort of fearfulness, men dare not so much as suspect or call in question the truth of a proposition which has been believed by almost all learned men. This I verily believe was the case in respect of the point we are now upon. Austin, and some others of reputation, first started it: to others, who would not be at the pains of examining into the truth of it, it seemed plausible, and so they received it. And by this means many learned men suffered themselves to be imposed upon, taking that for truth, which they certainly had rejected as false, had they but ventured strictly and closely to examine it. But numbers are no evidence of truth, and (as Mr. Whiston well observes in another place [t]) "a common opinion without a solid foundation is of "no great value." He that heartily and in good earnest seeks after truth, must not suffer himself to be impressed either with the *number* or *reputation* of those who think otherwise than he does. It was a noble resolution of Seneca's [u], "That he "would obstinately persist in the search of truth; not making "his understanding a slave to any man's, nor giving in to "any opinion, only because it was published under a great "name."

[t] Chronol. of the Old Testam. p. 16.

[u] Verum — contumaciter quæram; non enim me cuiquam mancipavi, nullius nomen fero, &c. Sen. Epist. 45.

I shall therefore endeavour to prove this *common opinion* (viz. that St. Mark epitomized St. Matthew) *false;* and I shall take the more pains in the matter, not only because I shall thereby invalidate Mr. Whiston's *most authentic evidence*, but set a matter in a clear light, which (as far as I can find) no one yet has attempted to do, and so withal recover the honour of this Gospel, (viz. St. Mark's,) which has so long lain under this hard and injurious charge, *of being extracted and compiled out of St. Matthew.* And,

1. It is very evident that St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, *from the accounts we have in ecclesiastical history of the manner and occasion of St. Mark's writing his Gospel.* The substance of all those accounts which we have is this, viz. *That St. Mark, (who was the companion and interpreter of St. Peter,) being at Rome with him, was desired by the brethren there, to give them an account in writing of what he had learnt from St. Peter, of the doctrines and life of Christ; that they did not desist in their entreaties till they had prevailed, and this was the cause or reason of the Gospel, we now call St. Mark's, being first wrote.* This in short is the account, and it seems to be as largely attested by the ancients, as almost any matter of fact whatsoever, at that distance from us. Papias, Irenæus, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, Jerome, and many others, all agree as to the main of this fact.

The most full and ancient relation of this matter is that of Clemens Alexandrinus, cited by Eusebius in two several places [x], and confirmed in the first of those places by the most ancient testimony of Papias. To the same purpose (though not quite so full) is the account of Irenæus, viz. "That St. "Mark committed to writing the things which he heard St. "Peter preach [y]." So Origen [z], "That St. Mark made or

[x] Παρακλήσεσι δὲ παντοίαις (scil. οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι) Μάρκον, οὗ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον φέρεται, ἀκόλουθον ὄντα Πέτρου λιταρῆσαι, ὡς ἂν καὶ διὰ γραφῆς ὑπόμνημα τῆς διὰ λόγου παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς καταλείψοι διδασκαλίας· μὴ πρότερόν τε ἀνεῖναι ἢ κατεργάσασθαι τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ ταύτης αἰτίους γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ λεγομένου κατὰ Μάρκον Εὐαγγελίου γραφῆς—Συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπίας. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 15. Idem vid. lib. 6. c. 14. vid. et lib. 3. c. 39.

[y] Μάρκος ὁ μαθητὴς καὶ ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, καὶ αὐτὸς τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Iren. Adv. Hæres. lib. 3. c. 1.

[z] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 6. c. 25.

" wrote his Gospel, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ, as St. Peter di-
" rected or taught him." The same account we have from Jerome[a] several times, Theophylact[b], and several others of the ancients. It was so far believed in the first ages, that St. Mark wrote his Gospel under the conduct and direction of St. Peter, that this Gospel was by a great many called *the Gospel of St. Peter*, and not St. Mark; so Tertullian[c] tells us, that "the " Gospel which St. Mark published was affirmed to be wrote " by St. Peter." Such is the account which we have from antiquity of the writing of this Gospel. There is one remark which I have made in reading this Gospel, which (though it may seem to some to be too nice a speculation) yet perhaps, considering the very many testimonies of the ancients, *that St. Mark wrote what he heard from St. Peter*, may have some weight in it, and be some confirmation of the preceding relation. The remark I mean is this, viz. *That there are in the Gospel-history several very remarkable circumstances relating to St. Peter, which are told by the other evangelists, and not so much as mentioned or hinted at by St. Mark.* The reason of which seems to be, that St. Peter's modesty would not permit them to be inserted, being generally such as were to his advantage, and would tend to advance his honour above the rest of the apostles, a thing which no doubt the good apostle would endeavour to prevent. For the manifesting of this, I will select a few out of the other instances which might be produced, viz.

1. The account of *Christ's pronouncing St. Peter blessed*, when he had confessed him, *the promise of the keys, and of that large power*, &c. made to him, are omitted by St. Mark, though the former and succeeding parts of the story are both told by him. See Mark viii. 29, 30. and compare it with Matt. xvi. 16—20.

2. The relation of St. Peter's working the miracle, *by getting money out of the fish's mouth to pay the tribute-money*,

[a] Marcus—juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus, breve scripsit Evangelium. Catalog. Script. Eccl. in voce Marcus. Vid. Præfat. in Comment. in Matt.

[b] Præfat. in Comment. in Marc.

[c] Evangelium, quod Marcus edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus. Tertull. Adv. Marcion. lib. 4. c. 5.

told by St. Matthew, ch. xvii. 24, &c. is omitted by St. Mark, though the preceding and subsequent stories are the same as in St. Matthew. See Mark ix. 30—33.

3. Christ's particular love and favour expressed to St. Peter, *in telling him of his danger, and that he had prayed for him in particular, that his faith might not fail*, Luke xxii. 31, 32. is omitted by St. Mark.

4. *St. Peter's remarkable humility* above the rest of the apostles, *about Christ's washing his feet*, &c. John xiii. 6—9. omitted by St. Mark.

5. The instance of St. Peter's very great zeal for Christ, when he was taken, *in cutting off the high priest's servant's ear*. John xviii. 10. is not mentioned by St. Mark concerning St. Peter in particular, but only told in general of a certain person that stood by; Mark xiv. 47.

6. St. Peter's faith *in leaping into the sea*, to go to Christ, John xxi. 7. not mentioned by St. Mark.

7. Christ's discourse with St. Peter concerning *his love to him*, and his particular repeated charge to him *to feed his sheep*, John xxi. 15, &c. omitted by St. Mark.

These are some instances of things tending to St. Peter's honour, recorded by the other evangelists, none of which are so much as hinted at by St. Mark. I add, that there is not any one single instance in all that Gospel, like unto any of those which have been mentioned. There is nothing in that Gospel which does in the least tend to advance the honour and prerogative of St. Peter above the rest of the apostles. Now, why these and some other particulars of a like nature should be omitted by St. Mark, is somewhat strange, unless we account for it thus; that St. Peter, who dictated this Gospel to St. Mark, through modesty and for fear of some bad consequences, caused him to leave out those things which so particularly concerned himself. Had not St. Mark had his Gospel from St. Peter, I cannot conceive why he should so studiously avoid the mention of all those remarkable things which tended so much to his honour. Much to the same purpose is the arguing of a learned popish divine on this head [d], out of Euse-

[d] Cur Marcus omittit illa magnifica promissa Petro facta a Christo, quæ leguntur apud Matth. vid. apud Euseb. lib. 3. Demonstr. Evang. c. 7. Petrus

bius. "Why," says he, "St. Mark should leave out those great "and honourable promises made to St. Peter, which we read "in St. Matthew, (ch. xvi.) may be seen in Eusebius, (De- "monstr. Evang. l. 3. c. 7.) St. Peter's humility would not "suffer him to tell these things to St. Mark when he was writ- "ing his Gospel. We may observe the three other evange- "lists relating those things which tend to advance the honour "and prerogative of St. Peter. Only St. Mark, who wrote his "Gospel from St. Peter's dictating to him, has omitted them; "which evidences the great modesty of St. Peter." This reasoning is abundantly confirmed by a very common and well-known observation, that authors of modesty are seldom forward to mention those things that tend to their own praise; so that we have at least a probable argument from the Gospel itself, to prove the account we have from antiquity, of the writing of it, true. The learned Dr. Hammond has another argument taken out of the Gospel itself, by which he endeavours to prove the account, that has been given of its being dictated by St. Peter, to be true. After having cited the account, he adds[e]; "Of "this there be some characters discernible in the writing itself; "as that, setting down the story of Peter's denying of Christ, "with the same enumeration of circumstances, and aggra- "vations of the fault, that Matthew doth; when he comes to "mention his repentance and tears consequent to it, he doth it "(as became the true penitent) *more coldly* than Matthew had "done, only ἔκλαιε *he wept;* whereas Matthew hath ἔκλαυσε "πικρῶς, *he wept bitterly.*" How far this argument is conclusive, I shall not now inquire; if this be not, perhaps there may be several of the like nature that are. I would only add, that St. Peter himself in his first Epistle[f] makes mention of St. Mark, as being along with him, and calls him *his son: The church which is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son.* There can be no just reason to

ex humilitate noluit hoc referre Marco scripturo evangelium; ubi nota reliquos tres evangelistas ea commemorasse, quæ ad Petri excellentiam et prærogativam pertinent. Matt. c. xvi. *Beatus es, Simon Bar-Jona,* &c. Luc. c. xxii. *Ego rogavi pro te,* &c. Et apud Joan. xxi. *Pasce oves meas.* Solum Marcum, qui evangelium scripsit, sicut Petro referente audierat, de his tacuisse. Quæ res insignem B. Petri modestiam nobis insinuat et commendat. Estius in Difficilior. Script. loc. ad Marc. viii. 29.

[e] Introduc. to Matt.

[f] 1 Pet. v. 13.

question, whether the same Mark is here intended, who wrote the Gospel; and if the word Babylon be here taken for Rome, as the fathers, the papists in general, and many other among the protestants[g] do take it, then the foregoing account receives a very great confirmation from St. Peter and St. Mark's having been at Rome together. So Jerome[h] and Eusebius[i] make use of this argument for this very purpose. The words of the latter are these; "But Peter makes mention of Mark in his first "Epistle, which they say was wrote at Rome, and it was that "which Peter himself meant, when by a strong figure he makes "use of the word Babylon to denote that city, viz. Rome, in "these words, *The church which is at Babylon, chosen toge-* "*ther with you, saluteth you, and Mark my son.*"

If then upon the whole it be reasonable to conclude that St. Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, at the request of the brethren there, from the things which he had heard of St. Peter; we have, I think, an undeniable argument that this Gospel is not an abstract or epitome of St. Matthew's. If his Gospel be a collection of what St. Peter had told him, then it is not a bare transcript of St. Matthew: for to say he took his Gospel from St. Peter's mouth, and transcribed it from St. Matthew's writing, is somewhat like a contradiction. But besides this, if St. Mark had had St. Matthew's Gospel along with him at Rome, why should the Romans have pressed him so very earnestly to make an epitome of it? Was it too long, and did it contain any things that were tedious or superfluous? The truth is, if St. Mark or any one else had had St. Matthew's Gospel at Rome, there would have been no need of St. Mark's writing. "If," says the famous cardinal Bellarmine,[k] "the Gospel of "St. Matthew had been then at Rome in the hands of any of "the Christians, when St. Mark wrote there, he would not have "wrote." And one would think they should rather have de-

[g] See Dr. Hammond on 1 Pet. v. 13. and on Rev. xviii. 2.

[h] Petrus in Epistola prima sub nomine Babylonis figuraliter Romam significans. Hieron. De Vir. Illustr. in voc. Marc.

[i] Τοῦ δὲ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ Ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης· σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα, διὰ τούτων· Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτὴ, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 15. Vid. etiam Vales. ad h. loc.

[k] Immo si tunc (scil. quando Marcus Romæ scripsit) evangelium Matthæi in manibus fidelium Romæ fuisset, credibile est Marcum scripturum non fuisse. Bellarm. de Matrimon. Sacr. lib. 1. c. 16.

sired St. Matthew's Gospel, being wrote by one that was an eye and ear witness of what he said. Besides, those for whom he wrote, wanted much of the zeal of the primitive Christians; nay, and of that zeal, which Eusebius says they had for the Gospel-history, if they did not desire an account of all that our Lord said and did. They would hardly desire, and be contented with a less full, when they could have a more full and perfect account. I conclude therefore, that St. Matthew's Gospel was not then at Rome, and consequently that St. Mark did not epitomize, or make any use of it, when he composed his Gospel.

CHAP. VII.

The second argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel not to be an epitome of St. Matthew's, because his accounts are generally larger, and contain many more particular circumstances, than St. Matthew's do. *This evidenced by several instances.*

Arg. II. *ST. Mark's Gospel is not an abridgment or epitome of St. Matthew's, because for the most part his accounts are much more large and full, and related with many more particular circumstances, than the same accounts are by St. Matthew.* There is scarce any one story related by both these evangelists, in which St. Mark does not add some considerable circumstances which St. Matthew has not; and if this be so, I think there can be no more convincing evidence that St. Mark did not design to epitomize St. Matthew: but if we were to conclude any thing of this nature from comparing them together, the conclusion must be, that St. Matthew in all these parts did design to abridge St. Mark.

The matter of fact, which I have here asserted, will easily appear to be true to any one who reads these two Gospels with this view, and compares them together. To save the reader the pains, I have collected some instances, and set them down in such a manner, that by a bare casting the eye upon them, the truth of that which I contend for will sufficiently appear, viz. that St. Mark is generally larger in his accounts than St. Matthew.

A Table of several instances, in which St. Mark relates his stories more fully and with more particular circumstances, than St. Matthew.

The story of the devils cast into the swine.

St. Matthew. Chap. VIII.	St. Mark. Chap. V.
Ver. 28. And when he was come to the other side, into the country of the Gergesenes, there met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way.	Ver. 1. And they came over unto the other side of the sea, into the country of the Gadarenes. 2. And when he was come out of the ship, immediately there met him out of the tombs, a man with an unclean spirit; 3. Who had his dwelling among the tombs, and no man could bind him, no not with chains. 4. Because that he had been often bound with fetters and chains, and the chains had been plucked asunder by him, and the fetters broken in pieces; neither could any man tame him. 5. And always night and day he was in the mountains, and in the tombs, crying and cutting himself with stones.
29. And behold they cried out, saying, What have we to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God? Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?	6. But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him; 7. And cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. 8. (For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit.)

St. Matthew.
Chap. VIII.

30. And there was a good way off from them, an herd of many swine feeding.

31. So the devils besought him, saying, If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.

32. And he said unto them, Go; and when they were come out, they went into the herd of swine, and behold the whole herd of swine ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and perished in the waters.

33. And they that kept them fled, and went their ways into the city, and told every thing, and what was befallen to the possessed of the devils.

34. And behold the whole city came out to meet Jesus; and

St. Mark.
Chap. V.

9. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion; for we are many.

10. And he besought him much, that he would not send them away out of the country.

11. Now there was there nigh unto the mountains, a great herd of swine feeding.

12. And all the devils besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them.

13. And forthwith Jesus gave them leave, and the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine, and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea, (they were about two thousand,) and were choaked in the sea.

14. And they that fed the swine fled, and told it in the city and in the country. And they went out to see what it was that was done.

15. And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the Legion, sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind, and they were afraid.

16. And they that saw it told them, how it befell to him, that was possessed with the devil, and also concerning the swine.

17. And they began to pray him to depart out of their coasts.

St. MATTHEW.

Chap. VIII.

when they saw him, they besought him, that he would depart out of their coasts.

St. MARK.

Chap. V.

18. And when he was come into the ship, he that had been possessed with the devil, prayed him, that he might be with him.

19. Howbeit Jesus suffered him not, but saith unto him, Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee.

20. And he departed, and began to publish in Decapolis, how great things Jesus had done for him; and all men did marvel.

The story of the paralytic healed.

Chap. IX.

1. And he entered into a ship, and passed over, and came into his own city.

2. And behold they brought to him a man sick of the palsy, lying on a bed.

Chap. II.

1. And again he entered into Capernaum, after some days, and it was noised that he was in the house.

2. And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, no not so much as about the door; and he preached the word unto them.

3. And they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four.

4. And when they could not come nigh unto him for the press, they uncovered the roof where he was; and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay.

St. Matthew.	St. Mark.
Chap. IX.	Chap. II.
2. —— And Jesus seeing their faith, &c.	5. When Jesus saw their faith, &c.

The story of Jairus the ruler of the synagogue's daughter restored to life.

Chap. IX.	Chap. V.
Ver. 18. While he spake these things unto them, behold there came a certain ruler and worshipped him, saying, My daughter is even now dead; but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live.	Ver. 22. And behold there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and when he saw him, he fell at his feet, 23. And besought him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death: I pray thee come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed, and she shall live.
19. And Jesus arose and followed him; and so did his disciples.	24. And Jesus went with him, and much people followed him, and thronged him.
	35. While he yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's house certain, which said, Thy daughter is dead: why troublest thou the Master any further?
	36. As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe.
	37. And he suffered no man to follow him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James.
23. And when Jesus came into the ruler's house, and saw the people, and the minstrels making a noise,	38. And he cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly.

St. Matthew.

Chap. IX.

24. He said unto them, Give place, for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn.

25. But when the people were put forth, he went in, and took her by the hand, and the maid arose.

26. And the fame hereof went abroad into all that land.

St. Mark.

Chap. V.

39. And when he was come in, he saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth.

40. And they laughed him to scorn; but when he had put them all out, he taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying.

41. He took the damsel by the hand, and said, Talitha Cumi, which is, being interpreted, Damsel (I say unto thee) arise.

42. And straightway the damsel arose, and walked, for she was of the age of twelve years; and they were astonished with a great astonishment.

43. And he charged them straitly, that no man should know of it, and he commanded that something should be given her to eat.

The story of the woman healed of the bloody issue.

20. And behold, a woman, which was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years—

—came behind him, and touched the hem of his garment.

25. And a certain woman which had an issue of blood twelve years;

26. And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse;

27. When she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment.

St. Matthew.

Chap. IX.

21. For she said within herself, If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole.

22. But Jesus turned him about, and when he saw her, he said, Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole: and the woman was made whole from that hour.

St. Mark.

Chap. V.

28. For she said, If I may but touch his clothes, I shall be whole.

29. And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up, and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague.

30. And Jesus, immediately knowing in himself that virtue had gone out of him, turned him about in the press, and said, Who touched my clothes?

31. And his disciples said unto him, Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?

32. And he looked round about, to see her that had done this thing.

33. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth.

34. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague.

The story of a boy dispossessed of a dumb spirit.

Chap. XVII.

14. And when they were come to the multitude, there came to him a certain man, kneeling down to him, and saying,

15. Lord, have mercy on my son, for he is a lunatic, and sore vexed; for ofttimes he falleth

Chap. IX.

17. And one of the multitude answered, and said, Master, I have brought unto thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit:

18. And wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and

St. Matthew.

Chap. XVII.

into the fire, and oft into the water:

16. And I brought him to thy disciples, and they could not cure him.

17. Then Jesus answered and said, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him hither to me.

18. And Jesus rebuked the devil, and he departed out of him; and the child was cured from that very hour.

St. Mark.

Chap. IX.

he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away: and I spake to thy disciples, that they should cast him out, and they could not.

19. He answered him, and saith, O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto me.

20. And they brought him unto him, and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him, and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming.

21. And he asked his father, How long is it ago, since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child.

22. And ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the water, to destroy him; but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us.

23. Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth.

24. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief.

25. When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee come out of him, and enter no more into him.

26. And the spirit cried, and

St. MATTHEW.
Chap. XVII.

St. MARK.
Chap. IX.

rent him sore, and came out of him; and he was as one dead, insomuch that many said, he is dead.

27. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up, and he arose.

The story of the fig-tree cursed by Christ.

Chap. XXI.

18. Now in the morning, as he returned into the city, he hungered.

19. And when he saw a fig-tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever; and presently the fig-tree withered away.

20. And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig-tree withered away!

Chap. XI.

12. And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry.

13. And seeing a fig-tree afar off, having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon; and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves, for the time of figs was not yet.

14. And Jesus answered, and said unto it, No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever. And his disciples heard it.

20. And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig-tree dried up from the roots.

21. And Peter calling to remembrance, saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig-tree, which thou cursedst, is withered away.

The story of our Saviour's disciples preparing a place for celebrating the passover.

Chap. XXVI.

17. Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread, the disciples came to Jesus, saying

Chap. XIV.

12. And the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the passover, his disciples said

St. MATTHEW.
Chap. XXVI.

unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee, to eat the passover?

18. And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Master saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples.

19. And the disciples did, as Jesus had appointed them; and they made ready the passover.

St. MARK.
Chap. XIV.

unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou mayest eat the passover?

13. And he sendeth forth two of his disciples, and saith unto them, Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man, bearing a pitcher of water; follow him.

14. And wheresoever he shall go in, say ye to the goodman of the house, The Master saith, Where is the guestchamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?

15. And he will shew you a large upper room, furnished and prepared; there make ready for us.

16. And his disciples went forth, and came into the city, and found as he had said unto them; and they made ready the passover.

By a very cursory and transient view of the preceding instances, every one, who is unprejudiced, will conclude, that St. Mark could not possibly design to abridge St. Matthew, unless abridging and enlarging do signify the same thing. His accounts are so much fuller, and contain so many more particular circumstances, than St. Matthew's do, that to suppose his Gospel to be an epitome of St. Matthew's is somewhat like supposing the whole to be less than a part. Nor is it only in the instances which have been produced, that St. Mark's relations are larger than those of St. Matthew, but also in abundance of others. It would be tedious to mention all the particular instances of this nature, especially to write them down at length, as I have done the former; I shall therefore only mention a few, and briefly hint what they are.

A Catalogue of some other instances in which St. Mark adds more circumstances to his relations than St. Matthew.

Chap. i. 45. The leper's publishing what Christ had done for him, after his cure.

Ch. iii. 20, 21. The multitudes following Christ, his friends laying hold on him, and charging him with distraction.

Ch. iv. 10. The disciples asking our Saviour the meaning of the parable of the sower, *when he was alone.*

Ver. 36. *Several ships* accompanying our Saviour in his voyage.

Ch. vi. 2. Our Lord's preaching *on the Sabbath-day in his own country.*

Ver. 5. The particular work our Saviour did in his own country, viz. healing some sick.

Ver. 6. His wondering at their unbelief.

Ver. 7. The manner of sending forth the apostles, viz. *by two and two.*

Ver. 37. The disciples' unwillingness to go to buy bread for the multitude, and the sum it would cost.

Ver. 40. The manner of the multitudes sitting down to be fed by Christ.

Ch. vii. 24. Our Saviour's desire to be concealed, but could not.

Ch. viii. 3. Some of our Lord's disciples came from far.

Ver. 6, 7. The blessing the seven loaves, and blessing the fishes, mentioned as done distinctly and separately; St. Matthew joins the blessing the loaves and fishes both together.

Ver. 14. The disciples had but one loaf.

Ch. ix. 10. The three disciples questioning one with another, what our Lord meant *by rising from the dead.*

Ver. 32. The rest of the disciples at a loss in the same particular, and afraid to ask Christ.

Ver. 44, 48. A further description of the torments and misery of hell.

Ch. x. 15. Christ's declaring, that they who did not receive the kingdom of heaven as little children should not enter into it.

Chap. vi. 14—30. There are several particular circumstances in the history of John's death, which are not mentioned by St. Matthew.

Ver. 32. The disciples afraid, when they were going up to Jerusalem.

Ver. 49, 50. Christ's ordering the blind man to be called, comforting him, his casting away his garment, and coming to Christ.

Ch. xi. 4, 5. A description of the place where the colt was found, and the owners demanding the reason of the two disciples, why they took it away.

Ch. xii. 32, 33, 34. The scribe approves what our Lord had said, repeats it, makes a just and useful remark upon it: our Saviour approves him, &c.

Ver. 37. The common people take pleasure in hearing Christ.

Ch. xiii. 3. The names of the apostles, who made the inquiry concerning the destruction of the temple.

Ch. xiv. 3, &c. Several particulars in the story of the woman's anointing our Saviour; such as the quality of the ointment, the breaking of the box, the value of the ointment in money, &c.

Ver. 12. The passover was to be killed on the first day of unleavened bread.

Ver. 54, 67. Peter sat warming himself at the fire.

Ver. 70. Peter said to be a Galilean.

Ch. xv. 7. The crime for which Barabbas was imprisoned.

Ver. 8. The Jews plead their privilege of having a criminal released at the passover.

Ver. 25. The precise hour in which our Saviour was crucified.

Ver. 42. The reason why Joseph of Arimathea came on that day to beg the body of Jesus, viz. because *it was the preparation, i. e. the day before the sabbath.*

Ver. 43. The character and office of Joseph of Arimathea.

Ver. 44. Pilate wonders Christ was so soon dead. His inquiring about it.

Ch. xvi. 1. The design of Mary Magdalen, and the other Mary, to embalm the body of Jesus with ointments they had bought for that purpose.

These are some instances of circumstances related by St. Mark in his histories, and not by St. Matthew; a person that will be at the pains carefully to compare these Gospels,

with this view, will find many more. But these seem to be sufficient for my present purpose, sufficient to evidence, that St. Mark did not design to abridge or epitomize St. Matthew's Gospel.

CHAP. VIII.

The third argument, by which it appears that St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. the remarkable disagreement there seems to be between these two evangelists, in several parts of their Gospels. It is first premised, that all these are reconcileable. Then the particular instances of their disagreement produced.

Arg. III. *THE disagreement which there seems to be between these two evangelists, viz. St. Matthew and St. Mark, in relating several circumstances of their history, is a clear and demonstrative evidence, that* St. Mark did not abridge St. Matthew, nor had his Gospel lying before him when he wrote his. To go about to collect the difference of these sacred writers, to make them appear *as many* and *as great* as possible, may seem very strange and unnecessary work in one who professes a value and respect for them. I think it needful therefore to premise, that however *great* and *many* the differences may seem to be between these two, (or indeed between any of the evangelists,) yet they have all been happily reconciled by the labours of ingenious and learned men. Of the many that have undertaken this matter, there are none who seem to have been more successful therein, than Austin [n] among the ancients, and the learned Frederick Spanheim [o] among the more late writers. Surprising discoveries have been made in the last age in this matter, by a further acquaintance with the customs and manners of the Jews, among whom our Saviour and his apostles conversed; difficulties, which seemed to be insuperable, have been sometimes easily solved by the discovery of some particular custom that was among the Jews at that time; and these discoveries have

[n] In his book entitled, *De Consensu Evangelistarum.*

[o] In his excellent dissertations, which he calls *Dubia Evangelica.*

been so many, and our helps of all sorts in this matter so great, that I will not be afraid to assert, that whatever disagreement may seem to be between these two evangelists, or either of the other, it is capable of a very satisfying and reasonable solution.

This premised, I say the difference between St. Matthew and St. Mark *is so great, and in so many instances*, as evidences almost to a demonstration, that St. Mark did not collect his Gospel out of St. Matthew: I do not now regard the difference that is between them in respect of the *order of time*, but in other circumstances.

I shall not be at the pains to observe every small difference which there is between these two evangelists in their histories. Those which are in the following catalogue will be sufficient to my present purpose.

A Catalogue of some instances in which the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark do seem to disagree.

The first remarkable instance we find of any difference between them is in the story of the miracle, which our Saviour wrought, in casting the devils into the herd of swine, in the country of the Gadarenes, or Gergesenes. The accounts we have, Matth. viii. 28, &c. and Mark v. 1. in which accounts we may observe a disagreement in two particulars.

I. As to the place where the miracle was wrought.

II. As to the number of persons dispossessed.

1. As to the *place or country* where the miracle was wrought, according to St. Matthew, it was when our Saviour was landed εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, *in the country of the Gergesenes*; see ch. viii. 28. according to St. Mark, v. 1. and so St. Luke, viii. 26. it was when our Saviour was come εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν, *into the country of the Gadarenes*. Now these were certainly the names of the inhabitants of two different places, as is very plain from Josephus, who several times mentions them as such. So when he is reckoning up [p] some of those cities, which the Jews had destroyed in Syria, he first mentions their coming to Γέρασα, *the city of the Ger-*

[p] De Bell. Judaic. lib. 2. c. 18. §. 1.

gesenes, and after that Γαδάροις, *to the city of the Gadarenes*. And in the same chapter [q], mentioning the several cities, that fell upon the Jews, who dwelt in them, he names the Γαδαρεῖς, *the Gadarenes;* and immediately after [r], reckoning up the cities, that were kind to the Jews, who dwelt among them, and did not destroy them, he mentions the Γερασηνοὶ, *the Gergesenes;* for there can be no doubt but Γερασηνοὶ and Γεργεσηνοὶ were the same persons. The old Syriac interpreter, who was perhaps a native of this or some country near it, perceiving this difference between the evangelists, thought it too great a one to be admitted into his version, and therefore in St. Matthew, as well as in St. Mark, translates it by the same word, *the country of the Gadarenes*.

2. *They differ, as to the number of persons dispossessed*. St. Matthew tells us they were *two*, St. Mark mentions only *one*. These, though they are not circumstances contrary to each other, yet are so different, that they undeniably prove, that neither of these sacred writers could make use of the other's Gospel in composing his.

Another instance to the same purpose is the story of the daughter of Jairus, the ruler of the synagogue, being restored to life again by our Saviour, told by St. Mark, chap. v. 22, &c. with circumstances very different from those with which it is told by St. Matthew, chap. ix. 18. For instance, according to St. Matthew's account, the ruler told our Saviour, that his daughter ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν, *was already dead*, and desired that he would restore her to life again: but according to St. Mark, the young woman was not dead when the ruler came to our Saviour; for he only says, θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει, *my little daughter lieth at the point of death;* and afterwards, when our Saviour was going along with him, some of the family came, and told him, his daughter was actually dead, and therefore it would be needless to give our Saviour any further trouble.

St. Mark, chap. viii. 10. tells us, that, after the miracle of multiplying the loaves and the fishes, our Saviour immediately

[q] De Bell. Judaic. lib. 2. c. 18. §. 5.
[r] Ibid. Vid. Suid. ad Γάδαρα et Γίρασα, et Lud. Dieu ad Matth. viii. 28.

took ship, and sailed into the parts of Dalmanutha; St. Matthew, chap. xv. 39. tells us, that in this voyage he went to the coasts of Magdala.

St. Mark, chap. x. 35, &c. tells us, that the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, came *themselves* with a petition to our Saviour, that they might be advanced to the highest places of dignity in his kingdom; that our Lord spoke to *them*, and reproved them for their ambition: according to St. Matthew, chap. xx. 20. not *they*, but *their mother*, came with this petition to Christ, and he spake to *her*.

St. Mark, chap. x. 46. relates the account of our Lord's restoring a blind person to his sight, when he was coming out of Jericho; St. Matthew, chap. xx. 30, &c. tells the very same story, with most of the same circumstances, concerning two blind persons.

St. Mark, chap. xii. 9. in the parable concerning the letting out of the vineyard, mentions a question of our Lord's, viz. *What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do?* and makes him to answer it himself; on the contrary St. Matthew, chap. xxi. 40. intimates, that our Lord put this question to the Jews, and tells us, ver. 41. that they made him the answer; and so those words are a confession extorted from the Jews, and not the words of Christ, according to St. Mark.

St. Mark, chap. xiv. 30, and 68, 72. recites our Saviour's prediction concerning Peter's denial of him, and his actual denying of him, in a very different manner from St. Matthew. Our Lord tells him, ver. 30. *Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice;* and accordingly St. Mark tells us, ver. 68, &c. that he denied him once, and then the cock crowed; denied twice afterwards, and the cock crowed again: on the other hand, according to St. Matthew, our Saviour told him (chap. xxvi. 34.) that he should deny him three several times before the cock should crow at all; and accordingly he makes him actually to deny Christ three times before the cock crew. See ver. 69—74.

St. Mark, chap. xv. 23. tells us, that when our Saviour was upon the cross, *they gave him to drink wine mingled with myrrh;* according to St. Matthew, (chap. xxvii. 34.) that which they gave him to drink was *vinegar mingled with gall.*

St. Mark saith, the superscription on the cross was this, THE KING OF THE JEWS; chap. xv. 26. According to St. Matthew it was thus, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS; chap. xxvii. 37.

St. Mark, chap. xv. 34. gives us our Saviour's dying words upon the cross, all in Syriac or Syro-Chaldaic, viz. *Eloi, Eloi, lama Sabactthani;* which was the language of the country, and that in which our Saviour spake[s]. On the other hand, St. Matthew puts down these words partly in pure Hebrew and partly in Syriac, *Eli, Eli, lama Sabactthani;* chap. xxvii. 46.

These are some of those instances in which these two evangelists differ; there are several other such to be found. But as there is not any one which will not admit a very reasonable reconciliation, so I think there is scarce any one of them but is of itself sufficient to prove, that neither of these Gospels was transcribed from the other. How can St. Mark be supposed to have had St. Matthew's Gospel lying before him, and to *have made that* (as Mr. Whiston would have it) *his almost only guide*, when he differs in so many particulars from him? I desire Mr. Whiston, and those who are of the same opinion with him in this matter, to consider this argument impartially; and to tell us, if it be possible, what those reasons were which made St. Mark differ so much from St. Matthew in his accounts, when he had his Gospel lying before him at the time of his writing. Were not St. Matthew's accounts just and true, and expressed as they ought to have been? This cannot be supposed. One inspired writer certainly never entertained such thoughts of another. Or did St. Mark make these differences with design to prevent any suspicions men might have that his Gospel was not his own, but borrowed, and made out of another? Indeed if this had been the case, he could not have taken a better method to have accomplished his end. One would have thought, that such and so many differences would have effectually screened and protected his Gospel from such a charge. But far be it from us to have any such thoughts of an inspired writer. Until therefore it be shewn,

[s] See the Syriac translation of Mark xv. 34. Instead of *Eli, Eli*, he renders it *Eloi, Eloi*, as it is in St. Mark. And though he use the word *Lemono* instead of *Lama*, yet there is no doubt but *Lama* or *Lomo* was a very proper Chaldaic word.

how it could come to pass, that there should be so many different circumstances in the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark, when the latter is supposed to have made use of the Gospel of the former in composing his, I must conclude he did not make use of it at all. I own indeed there is one method supposable, by which we may account for these differences between St. Matthew and St. Mark, though the latter did make use of the former's Gospel. The method I mean is that which Mr. Whiston has taken to reconcile their disagreement as to the order of time, viz. *Supposing our present copies corrupted in all these places, where they differ in other circumstances, as Mr. Whiston does suppose them to be in all these places where they disagree as to time.* But it being certain that no such corruption ever happened to the sacred text of either St. Matthew or St. Mark, it still remains unaccountable how these differences should have happened between them, supposing the one to have made use of the other's Gospel. Hence it was justly argued by Mr. Dodwell [t]; "That the "later evangelists did not see the writings of the former; for "if they had, it is impossible there should have been so many "seeming contradictions, which have exercised the minds of "learned men almost ever since the first constitution of the "canon." To the same purpose says Mr. Le Clerc [u]; "It is "not credible that Mark or Luke had seen the Gospel ac-"cording to St. Matthew, who otherwise would have avoided "—all seeming clashings."

CHAP. IX.

The fourth argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. because it has a great many histories which are not in St. Matthew. A catalogue of them. The fifth argument, viz. that it wants several remarkable histories.

Arg. IV. ST. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Mat-

[t] — Ut ne quidem resciverint recentiores evangelistæ, quid scripsissent de iisdem rebus antiquiores; aliter foret, ne tot essent ἐναντιοφανῆ, quæ fere a prima usque canonis constitutione eruditorum hominum ingenia exercuerint. Dissert. i. in Iren. §. 39.

[u] In his third Dissertation, concerning the Four Gospels, annexed to his Harmony.

thew's, *because he hath related several very considerable histories, of which there is not the least mention made by St. Matthew.* I have already proved[x], that he does, for the most part, add many more particular circumstances to his stories, than St. Matthew. I shall now shew, that he relates several entire histories, which St. Matthew does not; not only *a few additions which St. Peter informed him of*, (as Mr. Whiston[y] supposes,) but many remarkable and useful stories. This observation will be sufficiently supported by the following instances.

A Catalogue of some histories in St. Mark's Gospel which are not in St. Matthew.

Chap. i. 21, &c. The history of our Saviour's casting the unclean spirit out of the man in the synagogue at Capernaum.

Ver. 35, &c. The account of our Lord's retiring to a solitary place to pray, and Peter and many others following him.

Ch. iii. 13, &c. Our Saviour's going up to a mountain to pray, there first choosing his twelve disciples; their names, commission, office, &c.

Ch. iv. 26, &c. The parable of the kingdom of heaven coming without observation.

Ch. vi. 12, 13. The disciples going out to preach, casting out devils, recovering many that were sick by anointing with oil.

Ver. 30, &c. The apostles' report of their success, &c.

Ch. vii. 2, &c. The pharisees observe our Lord's disciples eating with unwashen hands, and the custom of the Jews in this matter, ver. 3, 4.

Ver. 32, &c. The miracle of the deaf and dumb person being restored to his hearing and speech.

Ch. viii. 22, &c. The history of a blind person restored to his sight at Bethsaida.

Ch. ix. 14, 15. The disciples' dispute with the scribes, and Christ's inquiry into it.

Ver. 33, &c. The disciples' dispute among themselves by the way, who should be the greatest.

Ver. 38, &c. The story of John's forbidding a person to cast

[x] Ch. VII. [y] Page 102.

out devils in the name of Christ, with Christ's discourse to John thereupon.

Ch. x. 10, &c. The disciples' inquiry about the business of divorce.

Ch. xii. 41, &c. Our Saviour's observing the money cast into the treasury, the widow's mite, &c.

Ch. xiv. 51, 52. The account of the young man that appeared naked with a linen cloth about his body, at the time when our Saviour was taken.

Ch. xvi. 9, &c. Christ's first appearance, after his resurrection, to Mary Magdalen.

Ver. 12. His appearing to the two disciples on the road.

These several histories (besides a great many particular circumstances already mentioned) are in St. Mark, and not in St. Matthew; which certainly never would have been, if he had designed his Gospel only for an abridgment of St. Matthew's. It is a thing unusual; nay, I believe I may venture to say, it is a thing which never has been known, for an epitomizer to make such large additions to the history which he abridges. St. Mark's Gospel therefore is not an epitome of St. Matthew's.

Arg. V. Perhaps, on the other hand, it may add to the improbability of St. Mark's Gospel being an epitome of St. Matthew's, that *there are several things wanting in it, and not so much as hinted at, which are in St. Matthew.* He that undertakes to epitomize a history, ought not to omit any considerable part of it. Now it is evident, that St. Mark has not the least remote regard to many of the parts of St. Matthew's Gospel. As near as I can guess, St. Matthew is about one fourth part larger than St. Mark, and those things in which he is larger are some sermons and discourses of our Lord, especially the sermon on the mount; besides, St. Mark entirely omitteth the genealogy, and the birth of Christ with all its circumstances. There are also two or three miracles mentioned by St. Matthew, and not by St. Mark. Now if St. Mark had St. Matthew's Gospel lying before him, and designed to make an abridgment of it, it is strange he should entirely omit, and not so much as slightly mention these things. He could not think that which an inspired writer had penned not worthy his notice; if therefore he had had St. Matthew by him when he

wrote, it is reasonable to suppose he would have mentioned these things, though he had omitted some circumstances, and done it more briefly. If any person were now to make an epitome of St. Matthew, and were in this respect to make it like St. Mark's, I am sure every one would blame it as not duly done. Mr. Whiston has made an epitome of the Gospel history; and it is no compliment at all, nor a character so great as that ingenious performance deserves, to say, it is a much better epitome of the Gospels (not only in this respect, but many others) than St. Mark's Gospel is of St. Matthew's. A just epitomizer should have at least the general heads of the history, which he abridges, in his epitome; St. Mark has not so much as this, and therefore Father Simon hath reasoned very justly in this matter [z]; "It is," says he, "worth observing, that "St. Mark cannot pass for a simple abbreviator of St. Mat- "thew, because he insists more at large than he doth in some "places; besides, if he had only a design to publish an epitome "of St. Matthew's Gospel, he would not have taken away the "entire genealogy of Jesus Christ, which makes one of the "most principal parts of it: it is not the custom of those that "epitomize the works of others to retrench the most consider- "able part of them."

CHAP. X.

The sixth argument, to prove St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, viz. because that supposition makes its inspiration more dubious and uncertain; it makes the author look like a plagiary. Two objections against this argument answered. The seventh argument, the supposing this Gospel an epitome detracts from its honour and usefulness. Spinoza and Father Simon for this reason assert most of the books of the Old Testament to be only epitomes made out of records that are lost. Lastly, the supposing this Gospel an epitome invalidates in a great measure its testimony to the truth of Christianity. The evangelists did not see one another's Gospels.

Arg. VI. ST. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome or abridgment

[z] Critic. Histor. of the New Test. part 1. c. 10. p. 89.

of St. Matthew's; because the supposing it to be so *makes its inspiration more dubious and uncertain.* That this Gospel (as well as the other historical books which are received into the canon of the Old and New Testament) was wrote under the conduct and immediate influences of the divine Spirit, is what I must at present take for granted. Mr. Whiston, when he wrote the proposition which I am now endeavouring to disprove, believed the writers of the Gospel history to be *inspired*[a]; and therefore it is not at all necessary I should now undertake the proof of this matter. There is only one thing I would offer to Mr. Whiston's consideration on this head, and that is, that many of the most ancient and genuine writers of the Christian church (such as Mr. Whiston himself reckons most valuable) give us abundant evidence that they believed, nay, and sometimes expressly make mention of, the inspiration of the Gospel-history[b].

Taking it then for granted that St. Mark's Gospel was wrote under the conduct of the divine Spirit, it is not reasonable to suppose it to be an epitome of St. Matthew; to be an epitomizer, and to be under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, seems to be a little inconsistent. For if, as Mr. Whiston says, "St. Matthew's Gospel, lying before him, was his "guide in writing his history," what need was there of the inspiration and guidance of the Spirit? If he had St. Matthew's Gospel lying before him, why could he not, without any immediate influences from Heaven, transcribe out of it here a piece and there a piece of the history, where he had a mind? a person endowed with the common and ordinary powers of nature, if he were but able to read, might have made as good, nay I may venture to say, a much better epitome of St. Matthew's Gospel, than this of St. Mark's is supposed to be. For my part, I freely own, that if it could be proved that St. Mark made St. Matthew's Gospel, lying before him, his main guide in writing his history, I should very much question whether he were inspired at all or no. The little necessity there was for inspiration, or the influences of the Spirit, to assist a person in

[a] Page 112.

[b] In this number are Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, and many others, who lived not much later than them.

transcribing another man's book, is a sufficient argument there was no inspiration at all. I conclude therefore, upon the supposition of St. Mark's Gospel being inspired, that it was not transcribed or extracted out of St. Matthew's.

Besides, to argue further upon the same supposition, how odd does it sound to hear a Christian say; "The Holy Spirit "inspired one person to write a history, and then inspired an- "other person to abridge it? The Holy Spirit thought fit at "first to have so much wrote, but then afterwards, that it "should not be quite so much." This is to make the Holy Spirit to cut off the superfluities of his own works. But this is an absurdity so great, that no one sure will be willing to defend; and yet defended it must be, and certainly true it is, if St. Mark be an epitome of St. Matthew.

It may indeed be objected here, that the same difficulty attends the account I have given out of the ancients, of the original manner of St. Mark's writing, as does attend the supposition of his being an epitomizer. It may be said, inspiration was as little necessary to St. Mark writing from St. Peter's mouth, as transcribing out of St. Matthew's Gospel.

To this, I think, it is sufficient to answer, that if the account that has been given be true, viz. that St. Mark wrote what he heard St. Peter preach, the inspiration must be rather supposed in St. Peter than in St. Mark, who was only as his scribe or amanuensis; and so no more was required of him, than faithfully to write down what St. Peter told him. Hence Eusebius tells out of Clemens Alexandrinus, that when St. Mark had wrote down what he had heard St. Peter preach, St. Peter, ἀποκαλύψαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, "by the instigation of "the Holy Spirit, approved and confirmed this Gospel for the "use of the churches[c]."

Arg. VII. St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's, because the supposing it to be so *detracts from its honour and usefulness.* The enemies of revealed religion may many ways improve such a concession, to the lessening the just

[c] Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 15. I own indeed, Eusebius, citing this account of Clemens in another place, seems to make it contrary to this, as though St. Peter *did neither encourage nor discourage this undertaking of St. Mark.* Vid. lib. 6. c. 14. For the reconciliation of which difference, I shall only refer the reader to Valesius's notes on the place last cited.

esteem we ought to have for this sacred book. To say this Gospel is only an abridgment of another, makes it liable to the opprobrious charge of being stolen, and its author to the black name of being a plagiary. An epitome indeed of another person's work, known and owned to be such, is not in the least liable to this charge; but for a person to transcribe the greatest part of another's book, to publish it in the world under his own name, without the least hint or intimation that he did make use of that other person's book, though he have the best ends and designs in his work, will be looked upon as a sort of pious fraud. This is not only what might be reasonably imagined and supposed, but has been really matter of fact. For as long since as *the latter end of the fourth century*, (in Jerome's time,) Ruffinus plainly called it *religiosum furtum*, "a religious theft;" and Pighius, a great advocate for popery in the beginning of the reformation, mightily pleased himself with these words of Ruffinus, designing, says my author Chemnitius[d], "thereby to "lessen the authority of the scripture." Hence Spinoza and Father Simon (who were two as true enemies as ever the sacred volume met with) have endeavoured to persuade us, that the several books of the Old Testament are only *extracts and abridgments of some larger records.* The former, (Spinoza,) after he had largely endeavoured to prove that the five books of the law were not wrote by Moses, but a long time afterwards, and also that the succeeding histories of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel I. and II. the books of Kings I. and II. were wrote a great many ages after the persons who are mentioned in them were dead, concludes they were "all wrote by Ezra, "and that they are only epitomes or abridgments of some "larger records which he made use of[e]." The same also is his opinion concerning the books of the Prophets; "When," says he, "I closely consider the books of the Prophets, I per- "ceive the prophecies which are contained in them were col- "lected out of other books; and that they are not in the same

[d] Pighius delectatur Ruffini verbis, qui evangelium Marci vocat *religiosum furtum;* ut, scilicet, eo facilius scripturæ auctoritatem posset extenuare. Chemnit. Exam. Concil. Trident. par. 1. De Script. Evangelist.

[e] Tractat. Theolog. Polit. c. 8. et c. 9. Hesdras (eum pro prædictorum librorum scriptore habebo)—non aliud fecit, quam historias ex diversis scriptoribus colligere.

" order in which they were said or wrote by the prophets, &c. " wherefore these books are only scraps and fragments of the " prophets[f]." Father Simon's opinion, and his conjectures to support it, are so very like those of Spinoza, that there can be no doubt but he borrowed his hints (however the greatest part of them) from him; he tells us expressly[g], "That it evidently " appears, that the most part of the holy scriptures that are " come to us, are but abridgments and summaries of ancient " acts, which were kept in the registries of the Hebrews." It is very easy to perceive the design of these gentlemen, in this their opinion, was to lessen the value and authority of the sacred scriptures; the former, that he might banish at once all revealed religion out of the world; the latter, that he might advance the honour of the church and priesthood to which he belonged. And indeed the method now mentioned seems to have a very natural and direct tendency to the end they aimed at. It is impossible to have the same value for the sacred books which we ought to have, if we believe them to be only extracts out of some records and registries that we know nothing of. There is indeed this difference between the opinion of Spinoza and Father Simon concerning the books of the Old Testament, and the common one of St. Mark's being an epitome of St. Matthew, that they suppose the original records, out of which the books of the Old Testament were taken, are all lost, but the book, out of which St. Mark was taken, we have still: this indeed is true, but let it be considered, that this difference makes them more necessary and useful, and St. Mark less so. As there could not be any very good reason which could induce St. Mark to make an abstract of St. Matthew's Gospel, (as has been in part argued already[h],) so it could not be (if a mere abridgment) of any great use, when it was made. Upon what grounds could St. Mark believe his epitome would be more useful than St. Matthew's original? An epitome of a history, every particular part whereof is abso-

[f] Cum ad hos (scil. prophetas) attendo, video prophetias, quæ in iis continentur, ex aliis libris collectas fuisse; neque in hisce eodem ordine semper describi, quo ab ipsis prophetis dictæ vel scriptæ fuerunt.—Quare hi libri non nisi fragmenta prophetarum sunt. c. 10.

[g] Critic. Hist. of the Old Test. b. 1. c. 2.

[h] Page 165.

lutely necessary to be known by all those who could know them, would be but of very little use to them, that either had or could procure the original.

Lastly, The supposing St. Mark's Gospel to be an epitome of St. Matthew *does in a great measure invalidate and set aside his testimony to the truth of the Gospel history.* If his Gospel be taken out of St. Matthew's, then it is evident that his testimony depends upon, and consequently amounts to no more than the single testimony of St. Matthew. It is true indeed, that an account of a matter of fact, attested by one credible and duly qualified witness, is sufficient to satisfy any reasonable and unprejudiced mind, and consequently one of the Gospels would have been enough to have rendered those, who rejected Christianity, inexcusable; yet since men's minds are naturally so corrupt, the more evidence and testimonies we have, the more strong and confirmed our faith is like to be, and we have greater probability of convincing unbelievers. Now, as has been said, if St. Mark's Gospel be taken out of St. Matthew's, it is of no use nor service in this respect. But on the other hand, if we receive the account we have from all antiquity, that he wrote his Gospel from the mouth of St. Peter; we have another very good evidence for the truth of Christianity, even the testimony of one who was continually with our Saviour, from the beginning of his public ministry till his ascension.

Now from all that has been said, I hope it is very reasonable to conclude, that St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's. If the accounts we have from antiquity be of any value, that he wrote it at Rome from St. Peter's mouth; if he relates the same stories much larger than St. Matthew does; if he relates the same accounts with very different, and seemingly contrary circumstances to those of St. Matthew's; if he gives us an account of several very considerable things which St. Matthew does not so much as hint at; if he omits several considerable histories; if the supposing this Gospel an epitome makes its inspiration more dubious and uncertain, and invalidates its testimony to the truth of Christianity; if all these things are so, then there can be nothing more reasonable than to conclude, *that St. Mark's Gospel is not an epitome of St. Matthew's.*

I might, if it were necessary, carry this matter somewhat further, and make it at least probable, that neither of the three evangelists (St. Matthew, St. Mark, or St. Luke) had so much as seen the Gospel of the other, when he himself wrote. For had either of them seen the Gospel of the other, it is very probable they would not have gone about to write the same things which were wrote before: and hence it is very observable that St. John, who (as will appear hereafter) saw the Gospels of the other three, does not relate the same facts which he saw the other three had done before him. I am partly beholden to Mr. Le Clerc [i] for this observation, and partly to the learned Mr. Dodwell [k], who endeavours also by several other arguments to prove the point I am now contending for. Upon the whole, that which is most probable is, that the evangelists who were scattered up and down the earth, into very distant countries, to preach the Gospel, by the solicitation and importunity of those whom they converted, were prevailed upon to write down the substance of what they had preached to them; in which good undertaking, God by his Spirit was pleased to assist them, keeping them from all error, *leading them* (according to his promise, John xvi. 13.) *into all truth*, and *bringing* (as our Saviour had foretold he should do, John xiv. 26.) *all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them.*

CHAP. XI.

If it be allowed that St. Mark did epitomize St. Matthew, it will not from thence follow that our present copies of St. Matthew are misplaced, and contrary to the order originally intended by the evangelist.

SINCE then St. Mark did not make use of St. Matthew's

[i] Quoiqu'ils n'aient pas vû les écrits les uns des autres: car ils n'auroient pas redit ce qu'ils auroient vû avoir été publié avant eux, surtout par des Apôtres. Aussi remarque-t-on que St. Jean, qui a vû sans doute les autres evangiles, a évité de redire les mêmes choses. See his French Test. at Luke i. 1.

[k] Sed et reliquos ab invicem non fuisse visos evangelistas vel exinde suspicio est, quod primo illi prædicationis anno res gestas duntaxat enarrent; reliquorum annorum paschatumque memoriam solus conservavit S. Joannes evangelista: unde posset quis fortasse colligere, visa esse ab eo et probata, suppletaque decessorum evangelia. Dissertat. 1. in Iren. §. 39.

Gospel in compiling of his, it is very evident that Mr. Whiston hath failed in his *main proof*, in what he calls his *most authentic evidence*, and *most convincing argument*, to prove, that *the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel in our present copies is very much misplaced, contrary to the method originally intended by the evangelist.* But,

II. If it were to be granted that St. Mark did abridge St. Matthew, yet it would by no means follow, that our *present copies of St. Matthew's Gospel are not in their true and first intended order.* Let us then suppose St. Mark's Gospel to be an epitome, and consider how Mr. Whiston[1] does argue upon that supposition. "If," says he, "St. Mark was the epitomizer "of St. Matthew, and had his history before him when he "wrote his own; it will follow, that either that copy of St. "Matthew, which he made use of, was in a different order "from that which we now have (in the chapters under consi-"deration); or else that he knew the order of his copy to be "wrong, and contrary to the original one, and so reduced it in "his epitome to the true and regular series of events, which "he learned from St. Peter. Now either of these is sufficient "for my present purpose; for it is evident that St. Mark does "not observe the order of the present copies of St. Matthew "(whom he epitomizes) in that part we are speaking of," &c.

This is Mr. Whiston's arguing; but, with submission to so great a judgment, I think it is very far from being conclusive, as will very evidently appear by the following consideration; viz. St. Mark making use of a copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, which was exactly the same with our present copies of that Gospel, might deviate and recede from St. Matthew's order, and yet not believe that order to be wrong, and contrary to the original one intended by St. Matthew. Mr. Whiston has here very artificially joined two things together, as the same, which are certainly different. *To be wrong in respect of the order of time, and to be contrary to the original copy*, are certainly two things very distinct. St. Mark's being supposed an epitome of St. Matthew's, proves indeed the former, viz. that he believed St. Matthew not to have observed the order of time in every particular, but not the latter. Why might he not, even

[1] Page 102.

having St. Matthew's Gospel lying before him, sometimes relate his histories in a different order from that of St. Matthew? He might easily perceive it was not St. Matthew's design (as indeed it was not his own in every particular instance) to relate all things exactly in the order in which they came to pass; and therefore might, if at any time he saw just occasion, recede from his order. Certainly this is a much more reasonable supposition, than that our present copies of St. Matthew are so much confused and disordered. For making the matter more clear, I would illustrate my argument by the following example.

Let us suppose, that, when Lucius Florus made his abridgment of Livy's History, there were several branches of it which were not placed by Livy exactly according to the order of time in which they came to pass, but interspersed up and down in the history, as the circumstances required. Let us suppose further, that Florus in his epitome had taken every one of these particulars, and placed them according to the most exact order of time in which they came to pass. Are we under any necessity of concluding, either that Florus knew his copy of Livy to be wrong, and contrary to the original one, or that the copies of Livy are since corrupted and disordered? By no means. Now this is exactly the case here, and therefore I conclude, that although St. Mark did make use of St. Matthew's Gospel in writing his, yet it does not follow that our present copies of St. Matthew are confused and misplaced.

CHAP. XII.

The particular branches of St. Matthew's Gospel which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced. Four propositions for the discovering the true order of time in the Gospel history. Several of those branches which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced, are so far from that, that they are in the exact order of time in which they came to pass. Instances of this produced.

IN the following pages[m] Mr. Whiston proceeds to shew,

[m] Page 103, 104, &c.

which those several branches or periods of St. Matthew's Gospel are, which he supposes misplaced in our present copies, and contrary to the order originally intended by the evangelist. They are contained in that part of the history which is *from the twenty-third verse of the fourth, to the end of the thirteenth chapter.*

For the use of those who may not have Mr. Whiston's book, I thought it proper particularly to set them down; that the reader himself may, from the rules hereafter laid down, judge concerning those which I do not particularly consider.

The periods of St. Matthew's Gospel, which, according to Mr. Whiston, are misplaced in our present copies.

1. The sermon near the mount, in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters; together with some verses at the end of the fourth, and part of the eighth chapter belonging thereto.

2. The voyage to the Gergesenes, towards the end of the eighth chapter.

3. The healing of the paralytic, the calling of Levi, his feast, and the discourse at it, in the former part of the ninth chapter.

4. The healing Jairus's daughter, with the woman that had the flux of blood in the way thither, of two blind men as he went thence, and of a dumb demoniac just afterwards; towards the conclusion of the ninth chapter.

5. The mission and instruction of the twelve apostles, in the tenth chapter.

6. The message from John in prison, with our Saviour's answer, and the following discourses, in the eleventh chapter.

7. The vindication of the disciples plucking the ears of corn, with the healing the withered hand on the sabbath, and Christ's avoiding the designs against him, in the beginning of the twelfth chapter.

8. The healing a blind and dumb man, and Christ's vindication of himself from the imputation of casting out devils by Beelzebub, with many discourses and parables following, in the rest of the twelfth, and almost the whole thirteenth chapter.

9. The cure of the leper, just after the sermon on the mount.

10. The cure of Peter's wife's mother, towards the middle of the eighth chapter.

11. Christ's answer to two that were ready to follow him, succeeding the former.

12. His coming the second time to Nazareth, in the end of the thirteenth chapter.

These are the twelve branches of St. Matthew's Gospel, every one of which Mr. Whiston supposes to be misplaced, and put, in our present copies, out of their true and originally intended order. Any one that considers these several branches, their number, size, &c. will be surprised to find such disorders here, and not so much as one single disorder in all the other part of this, or either of the other Gospels. But of this I shall say more hereafter. My business now shall be to consider the matter of fact, viz. whether these several periods are misplaced, or not. In order to the more clear discussing of which question, I shall lay down the following propositions.

Prop. I. *Sometimes each of the three evangelists, St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, have related matters in a different order of time from that in which they came to pass.*

That several portions of St. Matthew's Gospel are not now according to the order of time in which the things came to pass, is, I think, agreed by all, except the whimsical Osiander, and after him Molineus, and Codomannus. That St. Luke did not design in all things to observe the order of time has been already proved[n]. That St. Mark did not is also evident, because he in several particular instances agrees with the order of St. Luke, which is not the order of time, as has been already hinted, and will more fully appear hereafter.

II. *The principal and almost only methods of discovering whether any particular matter be in its proper order of time or not, in the Gospel history, are these two, viz.*

1. *By considering the phrases of transition or connection, by which it is joined, either to that which precedes, or that which follows it, or both.*

2. *By comparing it with the same history, in one or more of the other Gospels.*

This is sufficiently evident to any one who has in the least

[n] Page 143, &c.

considered the harmony of the Gospels. Sometimes there are indeed some circumstances in the story itself, which infallibly direct us where it is to be placed; but this is what happens but very rarely in the Gospel history.

III. *The phrases by which the evangelists do connect one story or discourse to another, are very often such as do not at all imply an immediate succession, in point of time, to that which precedes it in the history.*

For the proof of this, I need only refer the reader to what has been already said above, Ch. V. and desire him withal to consider, that the phrases or notes I mean, are such as these; καὶ ἐγένετο· ἰδὼν δέ· καὶ ἐλθών· περιπατῶν δέ· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα· &c. *and it came to pass; and Jesus seeing; and Jesus coming; as he walked; and opening his mouth*, &c. These are evidently such, as can be no way notes of the order of time. I would only observe here further, that such as these are generally the phrases that connect the parts of the Gospel history.

IV. On the other hand, *sometimes two stories or discourses are connected by such a phrase, as does necessarily imply the immediate succession of one to the other, in point of time.*

This will be evident by mentioning a few of them: they are such as these; καταβάντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους· καὶ ἰδού· ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς· ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ· &c. *And when he was come down from the mountain; and behold; while he spake these things unto them; behold there came; in that hour or instant*, &c.

Coroll. Hence it follows, that, if any two of the evangelists appear to relate a fact in a different order from the third, and do not make use of such a note, as necessarily joins it with the preceding or subsequent part of the history; the other evangelist, who does use such a note, must be supposed to have observed the order of time.

This observation is not only very just and reasonable, but necessary; the want of which has apparently produced many mistakes in the compilers of Gospel harmonies, who have too often made the agreement of two evangelists (commonly St. Mark and St. Luke) the rule of placing a story, without regarding the manner of its connection with the preceding or following story.

These things premised, I will endeavour to prove the two following particulars, which will be a sufficient confutation of Mr. Whiston's proposition.

I. Several of those branches which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced, and contrary to the order originally intended by St. Matthew, are so far from that, that they are not out of the proper order of time in which they came to pass.

II. It does not appear that any of those, which are in our present copies placed contrary to the order of time, are contrary to the order originally intended by St. Matthew.

1. Several of those branches which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced, and contrary to the order originally intended by St. Matthew, are so far from that, that they are not out of the proper order of time in which they came to pass. This will appear by the two following instances.

1. The history of the person whom our Lord cured of his leprosy, Matt. viii. 2—5. is not misplaced, but in the proper order of time in which it came to pass. It is placed by St. Matthew (supposing our present copies of that Gospel to be right) as what happened immediately upon our Saviour's descent from the mountain, where he had been preaching; "whereas," says Mr. Whiston, "that miracle was some months before that "sermon." I own indeed, several of the Gospel harmonizers are of the same opinion, and the reason why they are so is, because they found St. Luke (and perhaps St. Mark) to have placed this story a considerable time *before* the sermon on the mount. This indeed is true; but then it must be observed, that these two evangelists have related this miracle without any express notation of the time[o] when it was wrought. There is no circumstance, nor phrase, which connects it, either to the foregoing or the following part of the history: see Mark i. 40. and ii. 1. and Luke v. 12, 17. On the other hand, as it stands in our present copies of St. Matthew, (as Mr. Whiston rightly observes,) "it is immediately subjoined to the sermon on the "mount, in such a manner, as implies it to have happened just "upon Christ's descent from the mount." I appeal then to

[o] Hæc autem eadem leprosi miraculose sanati historia narratur a Marco c. i. 40. et a Luca c. v. 12. sed solus Matthæus hujus miraculi tempus atque ordinem significat his verbis, *Cum descendisset de monte*, &c. *Et ecce*, &c. Car. Mar. de Veil. ad loc.

any unprejudiced person, whether it be not more reasonable to suppose the other two evangelists have placed this story out of the order of time, as sometimes they are wont to do, than that it is transposed in our present copies of St. Matthew. This (viz. the present order of St. Matthew) will be abundantly confirmed, if we consider, that there is a very good reason to be assigned, why the two other evangelists have related this story out of its proper order; viz. *because it was wrought in a place where the other miracles, which they had just before given an account of, were done.* They had before been giving an account of two miracles which our Lord had wrought at Capernaum, viz. the casting out the unclean spirit in the synagogue there; and after that, the recovery of Peter's mother-in-law from a fever (Mark i. 23—29, &c. and Luke iv. 33—38, &c.) in the same town. Now this miracle of the leper's cure being done at this place, they mention it here together with those other miracles, though it was really done at another time. Indeed it is true, St. Luke relates, ch. v. 1, &c. the call of the four apostles between these two miracles, and that of the leper; but this is a very great confirmation of the foregoing observation, because this call of the apostles hath been already proved not to be in the order of time [p], and so is for the same reason placed here, because it was in the city or suburbs of Capernaum. If what has been said be duly considered, I cannot but think it will prove this branch of St. Matthew's history to be in the proper order of time. And indeed if it be not proved, I must do Mr. Whiston's hypothesis that justice to own, that it is, as to this instance, most certainly true: if the story of the leper be not in the proper order of time, either there must be a transposition in the history, or St. Matthew was mistaken, which nobody will suppose. Hence I cannot but wonder that Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Le Clerc, and others, have in their harmonies left St. Matthew's order, and followed that of St. Mark and St. Luke. I cannot see how they could join the first and fifth verse of this chapter, without supposing a transposition, which yet they certainly never thought of. Chemnitius [q], Osiander, and some few more, are much more consistent with themselves; who imagine this in St. Matthew, and that in St. Mark and

[p] Page 143.

[q] Harmon. Evang. c. 42.

St. Luke, to be different miracles; though there seems to be no foundation for this supposition, but only the difference in time.

What Mr. Whiston offers in defence of his opinion (viz. that this miracle was not wrought at this time) certainly very well deserves to be considered. "St. Matthew," says he, "as "well as the other evangelists, relates our Saviour's caution "to the leper to keep the miracle secret; *See no man know it;* "which certainly shews, it was not done so publicly as his "present order implies, viz. when the multitude was pre-"sent."

To this I answer, that our Lord may very well be supposed to give this charge of secrecy to the leper, when the multitudes were present; because we have an instance of his doing the same at another time, where a transposition cannot possibly be supposed. The place I refer to is Matt. xii. 15, 16. *And great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all, and charged them, that they should not make him known.* Besides, there may be very good reasons assigned, why our Lord should give this charge in the presence of a multitude, viz.

1. That it might appear to the multitude, *that he was not at all fond or ambitious of human applause, and so withal set his disciples a lively pattern of modesty and humility.* Our blessed Saviour himself tells us, that he *sought not to advance his own glory;* John viii. 50. This was a character which our Lord not only deserved, but which he seemed peculiarly careful to establish. To do this he had now (when he was come down from the mountain) a very fair opportunity. He could at once give a whole multitude to understand, that he did not affect or covet popular applause; *See thou tell no man; i. e. Do not publish and blaze abroad the cure that is wrought for thee; I desire not the honour that men will be apt to give me on such an account.* What could the people who were present conclude, but that he was a person of the utmost modesty? Besides, our Saviour was not only careful to be thought humble himself, but was concerned that his disciples should *learn of him*, and imitate his example in this respect: hence he tells them, Matt. xi. 29. *to learn of him; for*, says he, *I am meek and lowly in heart.* Now here, in the presence of the multi-

tude, he had a very fit season to recommend the practice of this virtue to them by his own example. "Hence," says Theophylact, [r] "our Lord, by this caution, teaches us, that we "are not to make ostentation of our virtues." And to the same purpose Cornelius à Lapide, Zegerus, and many other learned men [s].

2. It is not at all absurd, that our Saviour should give the leper this charge of secrecy in the presence of the multitude; because *hereby he gave them a very plain intimation, that he did not design to set up a temporal kingdom in the world; and so used a very likely means to prevent the ill consequences of their entertaining such an opinion of him.* Every body knows the Jewish nation had this expectation from the Messiah, that when he came, he would deliver them from their subjection to the Roman power, and restore their kingdom to its ancient grandeur. This is evident from abundance of passages in the New Testament [t]. Now it is very evident our Lord took all possible methods to prevent the Jews from entertaining this opinion of him. As soon as he perceived their design to proclaim him a king, he retired, and went from them all into a mountain alone, John vi. 15. Nay it is observable, that our Lord so much declined this character, that, for this very reason, he forbade his disciples to publish him as the Christ; Matt. xvi. 20. *Then charged he his disciples, that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.* He

[r] Vid. eum ad Marc. i.

[s] Id jussit ad vitandam ostentationem, et ut nos doceret, virtutes dotesque nostras non jactare. Ita Chrysostomus. Cornel. a Lapid. ad loc.

Noverat quidem Dominus illos non tacituros; (he is speaking of a like instance;) verum hoc ita præcipiens, nobis voluit humilitatis contemnendæque gloriæ præbere exemplum. Zeger. ad Matth. ix. 30.

[t] Hence it was that the mother of Zebedee's sons came with her petition, that her sons might have the highest posts in his kingdom. Il paroît par cette demande, que la femme de Zebedée, et ses fils (à qui St. Marc attribue cette demande ch. x. 35.) s'attendoient toujours à un regne temporel, quoique Jesus Christ leur eût pu dire au contraire, tant les préjugés de la nation Judaique étoient violens. It appears by this petition, that the wife of Zebedee, and her sons, (to whom St. Mark attributes this petition,) were always in expectation of a temporal kingdom, notwithstanding all that Jesus Christ was able to say to the contrary, so very great were the prejudices of the Jewish nation. Le Clerc on Matt. xx. 22. This is confirmed also by the discourse of the two disciples, after our Lord's resurrection, Luke xxiv. 21. *We trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel.* And St. John tells us, (ch. vi. 14, 15.) that when they were convinced by a miracle, which our Lord had wrought, that he was the true Messiah, they immediately were for proclaiming and making him a king.

knew that the idea of the Messiah, and that of a temporal prince, were almost the same in the minds of the Jews, at least that the idea of the one implied, and was inseparable from the other; and therefore, that he might avoid the suspicion of the latter, he would not, till after his resurrection, be publicly owned as the former. He knew if he had indulged them in this their opinion of him, seditions, tumults, and insurrections must necessarily have ensued. By this he had too soon drawn upon him the suspicion of the Roman governor, and so had been hindered to go through the time of his public ministry, which he designed. And now by this it appears, that a caution given to the leper, not to publish what was done for him, was not unreasonable, though in the presence of the multitude. Hereby they could not but perceive that our Saviour had no design to draw great multitudes after him; which was the most likely method to advance him to a temporal kingdom. They could not but conclude he was against being popular, and consequently against being made a king. This undoubtedly was that, which, among other reasons, influenced our Saviour to give the leper this caution; for we find that the leper disobeying our Lord's commands, and publishing his cure, he was for that reason obliged to retire, and could no more enter into the city, Mark i. 45. Hence it is well observed by Mr. Le Clerc, in an instance like this, that our Saviour commanded secrecy, that "he might not draw a "great multitude of people after him, for fear of a suspicion, "which might be entertained, that he had no design but to "raise a rebellion[u]."

3. It was not absurd for our Saviour, at this time, to give the leper a caution of secrecy; because his case and circumstances, notwithstanding the presence of the multitude, seemed necessarily to require such a caution. Under the Jewish dispensation, a person that had been leprous, and now supposed himself cured, was, by divine appointment, obliged to submit himself to the examination of the priest, whether it were so or not; Levit. xiii. Now had this miraculous cure of his been

[u] *Leur defendit d'en parler*, pour ne pas s'attirer plus de foule, de peur du soupçon, que l'on pouvoit former, qu'il ne cherchât qu'à exciter quelque sedition. Le Clerc on Matth. ix. 30. See also Dr. Hammond on Matth. viii. 4.

spread abroad, and reached the priest's ears, before this was done, there seems to have been danger of the two following ill consequences.

1. Very probably the malice of the priests would have carried them so far, that when they found he was cured by a person whom they so mortally hated, they would not have pronounced him clean. This is the opinion of Grotius, Le Clerc, Dr. Whitby, &c. For the confirmation of it, Grotius urges, that the miracle was wrought in Galilee, a great distance from Jerusalem, where the priests were; and that our Saviour (according to St. Mark's account, ch. i. 43.) sent him away in haste, lest the fame of the miracle should reach the priest's ears before he could get there.

2. Had this story been told to the priests, it is very likely it would have raised their malice against our Saviour, and incited them to persecute him, under the specious pretence of his having taken upon him to do that which belonged to the office, and was the sole prerogative, of the priests [x], viz. pronouncing a leprous person clean.

From all that has been said, I think it is very reasonable to conclude, that our Saviour might give the leper a charge not to publish what was done for him, till he had been with the priest, though there were several people present when the cure was wrought; and then there seems not to be any reason, but we may conclude this history is in its proper order of time.

2. Another instance of a history, which in our present copies is in its due and proper order of time, and yet supposed by Mr. Whiston to be misplaced, is that of the two persons who came to our Saviour, professing their readiness to follow him, Matth. viii. 19, &c. It is placed in St. Matthew between our Saviour's ordering a ship to be got ready, and his entering into it. And there cannot be any probable reason assigned why it should be placed any where else; for,

[x] Il semble que notre Seigneur ne vouloit pas s'attirer la haine des sacrificateurs, à qui la loi donnoit le droit de juger, si un homme étoit gueri de sa lépre, ou non. It is probable our Saviour had not a mind to draw upon himself the hatred of the priests, to whom the law had given the power of judging whether a person was cured of his leprosy or not. *Le Clerc ad loc.*

1. *It is a history not mentioned by either of the other evangelists.* So Luke indeed (ch. ix. 57, &c.) has an account exceedingly like this; but Mr. Whiston himself (as well as several other harmonizers) supposes these to be two different histories; and consequently the order of time, in this instance, is not to be proved from either of the other evangelists.

2. *The circumstances of the history are all such as agree very exactly with that part of St. Matthew's history, in which it is placed in our present copies.* At what time is it more likely to suppose that persons should come to Christ, and declare their willingness to go along with him, than just then, when they had heard him give orders to get a ship ready to go to another country? And when could our Saviour more properly make the answer which he here does, (viz. *The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head,*) than at this time, when he was leaving his own habitation and city, and going to travel in a strange country? There cannot be any place in the whole Gospel history, where it will be more agreeable to the context, than here. Mr. Whiston has however placed it after this voyage to the Gergesenes, which as, I think, no one besides him has done, so no good reason can be assigned for his doing so. The reasons which he offers for his placing it thus are,

1. *That these accounts are, in our present copies, interposed between two verses, which are perfectly coherent, and have a manifest connection without them.* This is indeed true, but does not imply the least absurdity in St. Matthew's present order. This branch is only a relation of something which came to pass between our Saviour's ordering his disciples to get a ship ready, and his going into it. It is true, if it had been entirely omitted, and St. Matthew had told us of our Saviour's entering into the ship immediately after he had given orders to prepare it, the connection had been very good and just: but if a story be told of somewhat which happened in the mean time, it does not at all spoil the connection, as evidently appears by considering it. Ver. 18. our Saviour gives commandment to some of his disciples, to go down out of the city to the sea-side, to prepare a vessel to carry them over to the other

side: when they were gone, and *while the ship was getting ready*, (as Dr. Wells rightly paraphrases the place,) or *preparing for their departure*, (as Dr. Whitby,) these persons came to our Saviour; he gave them their answers, and then went on board [y].

2. Mr. Whiston further argues, "that the nature of our Saviour's answer to the scribe, ver. 20. (*The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head*) plainly shews, that these accounts ought to follow the voyage to the Gergesenes. For such an answer," says he, "there could be no occasion before this voyage; but after it, when he had been just expelled by the Gergesenes, there was the fittest opportunity imaginable for such a complaint." Mr. Whiston will excuse me that I am forced to observe, that he has not been so cautious as he is wont to be in this matter. The place, which he assigns to this branch of the history in his Harmony, does most evidently overthrow his own argument for placing it as he does. This will undeniably appear, if we consider, that the place (according to our present copies of St. Matthew) where our Saviour had this conference with the scribe, was Capernaum, which is called Christ's own city, and lay close by the sea-side. This is manifest by the context. Now, says Mr. Whiston, at the place where it is said to be in our present copies of St. Matthew, i. e. at Capernaum, there could be no occasion for that answer, *The foxes have holes, the birds* &c., (the reason of which must be, because our Saviour was then in his own city, where his habitation was;) and yet in his Harmony he has himself placed this very same history at Capernaum, when our Saviour was returned home [z]. A plain instance how far the minds of the most learned men are biassed by their favourite and preconceived opinions. I conclude therefore, that this branch also of St. Matthew's history is so far from being misplaced, that it is in its proper order of time. It would be tedious to prove this of all the other instances. A due application of the rules laid

[y] Dumque alii ex discipulis artis nauticæ periti præeunt, ut navem parent, atque Dominum venientem suscipiant, in viâ ipsum scriba, et unus ex discipulis adeunt, animi sui voluntatem ipsi proponentes, et quisque eorum seorsim suum responsum a Domino accipit. Chemn. Harm. Evang. cap. 63.

[z] Page 301.

down in the beginning of this chapter will shew us, that there are several of the other branches that are in the order of time in which they came to pass, which are not only by Mr. Whiston, but some others, supposed not to be so.

CHAP. XIII.

None of those branches, which are not according to the order of time, in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel, are misplaced. This evidenced by considering several of them.

II. ALTHOUGH there are several paragraphs or periods in this part of St. Matthew's history which are not according to the order of time, *yet it does not appear that any of them are misplaced, or put into an order different from that originally intended by the evangelist.* It having been already proved, that these sacred writers did not always intend strictly to observe that order in which the facts they relate came to pass; it follows, that we are not hastily to conclude that a history is misplaced, because it is not in that order. This is for the most part Mr. Whiston's argument, there being in several of the particulars, which he asserts to be misplaced, not so much as an attempt to prove any more, than that they are not in the true order of time; though in other instances there seems at the first sight to be something more.

For the clear discussing of this matter, I must observe, that *the almost only method by which it is possible to discover whether a story be misplaced or not, is by considering the notes of its coherence with the context.* If it be apparent, by comparing any period of the history with the other evangelists, that it is not in its proper order of time, and if it have such a note of coherence, as necessarily joins it with the foregoing or following story, (as it stands in our present copies,) we must conclude, either that the evangelist was mistaken in writing, or that our copies are corrupted and altered since he wrote. The question then in this matter lies principally in this, viz. *whether in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel there are any periods of the history which are not in the order of time; and yet, as they stand in our present copies, are necessarily connected, ei-*

ther with the foregoing or following part of the history. Of this sort there is not one; but, on the other hand, all those that are really out of the order of time, are laid by the evangelist in his history, in such a manner, as plainly evidences that he had no design that we should believe that he intended to place them in that order.

I do not think it necessary distinctly to consider all these particular branches, because in so doing I shall be obliged to a dull repetition of the same things again and again; I shall only mention some, and among them those which seem most considerable.

The cure of Peter's mother-in-law, ch. viii. 14, &c. is placed by St. Matthew after the sermon on the mount; whereas it is plain, from the other evangelists, that this miracle was wrought a considerable time before. But then it is introduced by St. Matthew, and laid in his history in such a manner, as makes it plain that he had no design we should think it was in the order of time. He begins it thus, Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, &c. *and when Jesus was come into Peter's house*, &c. But on the other hand, St. Mark and St. Luke have so connected this story with the former, that it is impossible to separate the one from the other. They both agree that our Saviour went from the synagogue immediately to St. Peter's house, and there wrought this miracle: see Mark i. 29, &c. and Luke iv. 38, &c.[a]

The same may be argued in respect of the other branches, viz. *the mission and instruction of the twelve apostles*, chap. x. 1, &c. and *the sending of John's disciples to Christ*, chap. xi. 2, &c. which, being out of the order of time, are not connected to the context by any notations of that order.

Of the other seven branches, there are two, or perhaps more, that seem to be in the same order in which they came to pass; though I must own there are also two which seem not to be in the order of time; and yet have such notes of time prefixed to them, as seem to imply immediate succession. It

[a] Marcus certiorem notationem temporis et ordinis servat.—Manifestum est Matthæum—non servasse ordinem—unde et tali usus est locutione, quæ non necessario exigit ordinem consequentiæ eorum, quæ narrantur; dicit enim, *Et cum venissent in domum Petri*, &c. Chemnit. Harmon. Evang. cap. 38.

is necessary that both these instances be particularly considered.

1. The first is the cure of Jairus's daughter, ch. ix. 18, &c. "This," says Mr. Whiston, "so immediately follows the discourse of Levi's feast, and with such an express notation of "the very moment of time, as is peculiarly remarkable, Ταῦτα "αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, &c. *as he was speaking, or while he* "*spake, these things unto them, behold a ruler*, &c. So that "no unbiassed reader could imagine the least space possible "interposed between them; whereas above half a year was "gone, after the feast of Levi, before the healing of Jairus's "daughter. An undeniable instance of the dislocations be"fore mentioned in this Gospel; and I think I may well call "it an undeniable one, since truly it was so to me. For "though, at the first, I durst not so far depend upon the other "notes of time, as to believe the present order of this part of "St. Matthew to be different from the original one; yet when "I came to this, after a little attempt, I found it impossible to "be got over," &c. This instance therefore is plainly the main support of Mr. Whiston's hypothesis; and I own indeed it seems very much to his purpose, though, upon a close examination, I find it will not prove what he designs it should. There are several more probable methods of accounting for the difficulty, than by supposing a dislocation; but before I come particularly to consider any, I think it necessary a little more clearly to state the case.

St. Matthew, ch. ix. 9, gives us an account of his call by our Saviour to follow him; ver. 10. he tells us of a feast at his house, where many publicans and sinners were also present; ver. 11. he informs us of a question, put by the Pharisees to our Saviour's disciples, concerning his eating with sinners; and ver. 12, 13. our Saviour's answer; after this, ver. 14, we have an account of John's disciples coming to Christ, and asking him, why his disciples did not fast? and ver. 15, 16, 17. our Saviour's answer to their question, *which whilst he was giving, Jairus came*, ver. 18. But, says Mr. Whiston, there was half a year's space between the feast of Levi and Jairus's coming to Christ. This is indeed easily asserted, but not the least reason offered for the assertion. It were to be wished,

that in this, as well as other instances, he had told us, for what reasons he supposes them to be out of the order of time. A bare asserting that a story is so much too soon, or so much too late, or a referring us to his Harmony, where he has so placed it, cannot be thought sufficient; and indeed this is all that Mr. Whiston has done in this and several other instances. But this is too considerable a point to be given up so easily. For the sake of stating the case more fully, let us consider the reason of this assertion. It is in short only this, that St. Mark and St. Luke place a great many of our Lord's discourses and miracles between this feast of St. Matthew and the discourses which follow it, and the coming of Jairus to our Saviour. The former is placed by St. Mark, ch. ii. 14, &c. and by St. Luke, ch. v. 27, &c. The latter by St. Mark, ch. v. 22, &c. and St. Luke, ch. viii. 41, &c. This is the difficulty, for the solution of which there may be two or three expedients, but I shall only make use of one, which is, that *of supposing there was some time interposed between St. Matthew's being called to be an apostle, and his entertaining our Saviour at his house.* This supposed, will reconcile the evangelists, and make St. Matthew's notation of the time, when Jairus came, to be very just and proper. Let us then suppose, that St. Matthew was called at the time where St. Mark and St. Luke place it, viz. before the sermon on the mount, and the voyage to the Gergesenes, (and this indeed is probable,) and that those evangelists, having a mind to finish *at once and together* all they designed to say concerning St. Matthew in particular, mentioned there also his feast, and the discourse at it, though they were some time after his call. On the other hand, let us suppose that St. Matthew being about to mention his feast, and the discourse at it, in its proper order of time, (viz. soon after the return from the country of the Gergesenes,) premised there the account of his call, which yet was some time before. If this be allowed, then there is no absurdity in supposing Jairus's coming to Christ, while he was talking to John's disciples at Levi's feast. I own indeed the preceding hypothesis is not entirely my own; I received the first hints of it from Chemnitius and Dr. Lightfoot, and thereupon examined into the matter with the utmost diligence and impartiality; and after having weighed

all the several circumstances of the stories under consideration, I made the following observations, which seem to support the account that has been given.

1. *There are many instances of a like nature with this, both among the writers of the Gospel history, and other historians.* It is a very common thing with all writers, when they design to say but little of a person in their history, to join it all together, although what they relate came to pass at very distant times. This has been already shewn [b], and is very evident in the case of Shimei, 1 Kings ii. 36, &c. His building a house at Jerusalem, and his being put to death, are connected together, (like St. Matthew's call and feast,) though they were plainly three years distant in point of time. But this is an observation too common and obvious to need any instances to be produced to support it.

2. The supposing St. Matthew's call and feast to have been at two different times *does not make the history of either of the evangelists at all the more inaccurate.* It is so far from giving colour to any such charge, that it is really the best method of writing a history, as has been proved above [c].

3. It is very observable, *that neither of the three evangelists do join the account of Levi's call, and his feast together, by any such notes of time or phrases, as imply the immediate succession of one to the other.* St. Matthew and St. Mark, after having related the call, subjoin the story of the feast, introduced thus, Καὶ ἐγένετο, *And it came to pass.* St. Luke only tells us, that *Matthew made him a feast*, not at all specifying the time when it was made.

4. It is also remarkable, that St. Mark and St. Luke, when they had finished the account of Levi's feast, and the discourse at it, *do not join the following history to this with any note of time, so as to imply that it immediately followed it.* But on the other hand, both of them begin the next story thus, Καὶ ἐγένετο, *And it came to pass*, Mark ii. 22, 23. and Luke v. ult. and vi. 1. Now hence it follows, according to the corollary above, p. 197. that St. Matthew, who has prefixed a plain note of time to this history, is to be supposed to have observed the right order of time.

[b] Page 152. [c] Ibid.

5. *The story of Jairus's coming to our Saviour cannot be placed any where else in St. Matthew's Gospel, but where it is in our present copies.* This will appear from the phrase by which it is introduced, Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, *While he was speaking these things unto them.* It is plain, that, when St. Matthew wrote this, it immediately followed some discourse of our Lord's to *several persons.* But I assert, upon a close review of all the branches of this part of the history, there is not any one of them, after which St. Matthew can possibly be supposed to have wrote it, but after the discourse to which it is now subjoined in our present copies. Hence it is very ridiculous in Mr. Le Clerc, and some other harmonizers, to place this period of the history after that which is not a discourse of our Saviour's, but the words of the historian, viz. those, Matt. viii. 33. Mr. Whiston indeed has placed it after a discourse of our Saviour's to one of his disciples, Matt. viii. 22. but it is certain it was not wrote by St. Matthew, immediately after that branch, because that has been proved to be in its proper order of time [d]. Besides, the words immediately preceding, according to Mr. Whiston's Harmony, are, Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀκολούθει μοι, καὶ ἄφες, &c. *But Jesus said unto* him, *Follow* thou *me, and do* thou *suffer the dead,* &c. Our Saviour is speaking to one person in the singular number; and is it then likely that St. Matthew's next words should be, Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, *While he was speaking to* them, &c. in the plural number? But now as it stands in our present copies, *speaking to them* (αὐτοῖς) very well follows the discourse with John's disciples. All this considered, makes it, I think, exceeding probable, that Jairus's coming to our Saviour was immediately after the discourse that immediately precedes it in our present copies; and consequently, if that discourse was at Levi's feast, that feast is now in its proper order: and so, if the call of Matthew was at that other time, where St. Mark and St. Luke do place it, the call and the feast were at two different times.

6. This will be yet further confirmed, if we consider the place where St. Mark and St. Luke relate this account of Jairus's coming to Christ. They place it immediately after the history of our Saviour's return from the country of the Gerge-

[d] Page 204, &c.

senes, and not after any discourse of our Lord's immediately preceding it. Now it is certain by St. Matthew's account, that it was at a time when our Lord was discoursing with several people; it is plain therefore, that, in St. Mark and St. Luke's account, this story does not in point of time immediately follow that which it follows in the history, but some discourse of our Lord intervened in the mean time. Now either this intervening discourse is somewhere related in these Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, or it is not. If we say it is, there can be no doubt but that it is the discourse which now immediately precedes it in our present copies of St. Matthew, and so the dispute is ended. On the other hand, to say it is not, seems very unreasonable, when we consider that the discourse, which immediately precedes it in St. Matthew, is in these Gospels; and that a very good reason has been assigned why they put it in another place, viz. because they had a mind to relate St. Matthew's call and feast, and the discourse at it, all together.

7. It may not be improper to observe, that in the ancient Harmonies of Tatian and Ammonius, (one of which was made in the second, and the other in the beginning of the third century,) St. Matthew's call and feast were placed at two very distant times, and many histories interposed between them [e]. Austin, in his excellent treatise of the Harmony of the Gospels, by a very good argument, proved that St. Matthew's call is not in his Gospel in the right order of time, but was before the sermon in the mount; because, says he, "St. Luke men-"tions St. Matthew among the rest of the apostles that were "with our Saviour in the mount." (ch. vi. 15.) He seems indeed to have been inclined to believe that the feast was sometime after the call; and hence Gerson, Chemnitius, and many others, have imagined this father of that opinion; but it is very plain to any one who will consider his words closely, they have mistaken his meaning [f].

[e] Atque hoc modo vetustissimæ etiam Harmoniæ Tatiani et Ammonii distincte ponunt, primo vocationem Matthæi, et postea convivium Matthæi in alio loco Harmoniæ, ut alio tempore post factum, collocant. Chemnit. Harm. Evang. cap. 43. in princ.

[f] Hinc autem probabilius videtur, quod hæc prætermissa recordando Matthæus commemorat; quia utique ante illum sermonem in monte habitum, credendum est vocatum esse Matthæum: in eo quippe monte, tunc Lucas commemorat omnes duodecim ex pluribus discipulis electos, quos et apostolus nominavit. *Afterwards, speak-*

Thus I have endeavoured, by several arguments, to confirm the supposition of Levi's call and feast being at two different times, and by a great deal of pains have endeavoured to get over a difficulty, which Mr. Whiston, *after a little attempt, concluded impossible to be got over.* There is indeed another way of solving this difficulty, proposed by Dr. Wells in his late paraphrase on this place. That I may not misrepresent him, I shall set it down in his own words: "A considerable time "after what is related in the foregoing paragraph, namely, "when Jesus was just come back from the country of the Ger- "gesenes, (as was related chap. viii. 28. and ix. 1.) some others "seem to have come to Jesus about the same subject; where- "upon he gave them the same reasons why it was not proper "for his disciples to fast yet. *And*[g] *now it was, that while he "spoke these things unto them, behold there came a certain "ruler,*" &c. In his annotations on the place, he tells us; "This "seems the best, because the most natural and easy way to re- "concile this, Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἄρχων, &c. of St. "Matthew, with Mark v. 22. and Luke viii. 41." This opinion supposes the call of Levi, his feast, and the discourse that followed it, to be in our present copies of St. Matthew out of its proper order of time; and also that our present copies are exactly in this place, as St. Matthew wrote at first, viz. that after the discourse with John's disciples, St. Matthew immediately wrote, Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, *While he spake these things to them.* Now according to the doctor, this αὐτοῖς, *them*, must not refer to those to whom our Saviour was talking at Levi's feast, but to some others that he had discoursed with about half a year before. Is it credible that St. Matthew would write thus? Christ spake such and such things to John's disciples; and while he was speaking *to them*, i. e. according to the doctor, while he spake to *some other persons.* This is far from being *natural* and *easy*; it makes the evangelist write not only inaccurately, but to a high degree absurdly[h]. But this is no new thing with Dr. Wells.

ing of his feast, he adds: Posset videri, non hoc ex ordine subjunxisse, sed quod alio tempore factum est, recordatus interposuisse, nisi Marcus et Lucas, qui hoc omnino similiter narrant, manifestarent in domo Levi discubuisse Jesum, &c. De Consens. Evang. l. 2. c. 26, 27.

[g] Matt. ix. 18.

[h] Le Clerc, in his Paraphrase upon

2. The other instance which seems to be out of its due order of time, and yet to have a note of immediate succession prefixed to it, is *that of the disciples plucking the ears of corn on the sabbath day*, chap. xii. 1, &c. As it lies in our present copies, it follows the message of John the Baptist out of prison to Christ, with this notation of succession, Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, *At that time, Jesus went out on the sabbath day through the corn*, &c. whereas, says Mr. Whiston, this plucking of the ears of corn was some months before the message of John the Baptist. For the proof of this, Mr. Whiston thinks it enough here, as well as in most of the other instances, to refer us to his Harmony; "as," says he, "will be evident in the Har-"mony." He attempts no other proof than this; and this really amounts to no more than if he had said, *I have placed it so in my Harmony, and therefore St. Matthew wrote so.* It is true St. Mark and St. Luke have placed this matter a great deal sooner in their history, viz. before the sermon on the mount; but then it does not appear that they designed to connect it to the preceding history by any express notation of the time. But though we take this for granted, and suppose that in our present copies of St. Matthew this story of *the disciples plucking the ears of corn on the sabbath day* is not in its proper order of time; yet it does not appear to be misplaced since it was first wrote, because it is not connected to the preceding part of the history by a phrase that necessarily implies immediate succession in point of time. The phrase here made use of by St. Matthew is, Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, *At that time*, or *about that time;* which phrase is undoubtedly made use of in scripture chronology in a very large sense. So in the instance above mentioned[i] out of the Old Testament, viz. that of Judah's going down to his brethren, Gen. xxxviii. 1. the story is introduced with the very same phrase, בעת ההוא, *At that time;* whereas that history, to which it is prefixed, happened a considerable time before that which it immediately succeeds. This phrase therefore is not, as Mr. Whiston calls it, "a nota-

the Harmony of the Gospels, is the only person that I know of (besides the doctor) who has taken this method of reconciling the evangelists; and I cannot but think, when the doctor comes to consider this matter again, he will not be ashamed to own that he borrowed his opinion from Le Clerc.

[i] Page 156.

" tion of succession," and consequently does not prove a dislocation in this part of the Gospel history. Mr. Whiston does indeed in another book (viz. his Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies, p. 71.) make use of this same note for the same end, viz. to prove the transposition of the sixth and seventh verses of the tenth chapter of Deuteronomy. But I need take no more pains to shew that this phrase does not imply immediate succession; Mr. Whiston himself, in his Chronology of the Old Testament, p. 73. in direct contradiction to himself in these two places, has very well proved it, by the same instance which I just now mentioned out of Gen. xxxviii. 1. His words are; " But then we must remember, that although the words, " *at that time*, seem to refer us to the foregoing history of Jo- " seph, yet the expression is of a much larger extent in the " language of scripture, and includes a great space of time, as " will appear by a view of the instances in the margin [k], of that " and the like ways of speaking, both in the Old and New Tes- " tament. Nay indeed, it seems to be little more than a par- " ticle of transition, or common way of introducing and begin- " ning a new branch of an history; just like the English par- " ticle, *now*, as it is used at this day; which, though at first it " might infer a connection, in point of time, with what went be- " fore, yet now it is plain it is frequently no more than a par- " ticle of transition, to introduce a new period, after we have " made a full end of that which went before." It is well observed by Mr. Whiston here, that this phrase is often used thus in scripture. Dr. Wells has observed [l], that this phrase is used *three times* in St. Matthew in this lax sense. " The Greek " expression aforementioned (viz. Ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ) is not " to be understood in a strict sense, or so as to denote that the " particulars, which they usher in, were done or fell out in that " point of time, which followed next in order to the time " wherein came to pass the particulars next afore related by " St. Matthew; but the said Greek phrase is to be understood " in a large sense, so as to denote a considerable interval or " space of time, in or during which the several particulars, " which are ushered in by the said Greek phrase, did come to

[k] Deut. x. 8. 2 Kings xx. 1. 2 Chron. xxxii. 24. Isai. xxxviii. 1. Matt. iii. 1.
[l] See his Paraphrase on Matt. ii. 25.

" pass," &c. Thus rightly has the doctor explained this phrase. The observation is indeed very trite and common; Usher, Spanheim, Dr. Lightfoot, Chemnitius, and many others, have made the same remark. I rather chose to cite the doctor's words on this head, because he seems in them to have had a direct design to confute Mr. Whiston's hypothesis; for he adds, " Hereby are easily solved all objections urged against " St. Matthew's Gospel, as being faulty as to wrong dating of " several particulars of our Saviour's history, without having " recourse to such notions, as that St. Matthew writ on loose " papers, which have not been put together in their due or- " der." I was the more willing to mention this, because I know not that any one besides has taken the least public notice of this proposition of Mr. Whiston's, which seems so injurious to the honour of this part of the sacred volume.

CHAP. XIV.

Mr. Whiston's method of accounting for the disorder he supposes in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel, viz. that St. Matthew wrote it on small pieces of paper; that these were confusedly put together by those who did not perfectly understand the true series of the history. Mr. Toinard of the same opinion. The improbability of it, proposed to be shewn from the ancient way of writing. The most ancient methods considered.

HAVING considered thus far Mr. Whiston's proof, that the several periods of the history in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel are misplaced, I proceed now to consider the following section. [m] The design of the section is, to *observe what might be the probable occasions of the present mistaken places of these several branches*. Now in order to this, Mr. Whiston is forced to a very odd and strange supposition, such as I am very much inclined to believe he never would have espoused, had he sufficiently weighed, and been aware of, its consequences: " I " must," says he, " here take it for granted, that the several " parts or periods of this former part of St. Matthew's Gospel

[m] Page 108.

" were written at first separately, and upon several distinct " papers; which papers (or whatever they were written upon) " were put together into their present order by those who did " not perfectly know the true series of the history."

I have more largely observed in the preface, that Spinoza and Father Simon have taken this method to depreciate and vilify the sacred volume, supposing that several parts of it were confusedly put together by those who did not know the right and true order of the history. It is indeed a very easy way of accounting for many of the difficulties of chronology in the Old Testament, as well as in the Gospels, if the matter of fact could be made certain. If there are indeed several parts of the history transposed and misplaced, I cannot conceive any other way so probable, by which the supposed disorders can be accounted for, as this; I must therefore do Mr. Whiston that justice to own, to his honour, that he has hit upon the only possible method of accounting for the dislocations he supposes to have happened to this part of St. Matthew's Gospel. In the next section he tells us indeed [n], " that he once de- " signed to have attempted to offer some conjectures, how so " many of these sections came to be so strangely transposed;" but this, I confess, is what I am not able to understand. He says here, " that he supposes the several disordered parts or " periods were wrote at first separately, and upon distinct " pieces of paper, and placed in this wrong order by those, " who did not know the true series of the history;" and then adds, " that he will observe what were the probable occasions " of their present mistaken places." And is not this offering conjectures how they came to be transposed? I ask Mr. Whiston's pardon, if it appear that I am mistaken in saying, that he had before offered all the conjecture that either he or any man could offer. Mr. Toinard [o], a French gentleman, (who was reputed in his country one of the greatest scholars of the age,) composed a *Harmony of the Gospels in Greek*, which was published about a year after his death, (A. D. 1707.) in which he seems to be of the very same opinion with Mr. Whiston in this matter. I have not been able to

[n] Page 110.

[o] See his character in the supplement to the last edition of Mr. Moreri's French Dictionary.

procure the book itself, and so could not compare his and Mr. Whiston's Harmony together. A general account of his opinion I learnt from the abstract of his book, which Mr. Le Clerc hath given us in his *Bibliothèque Choisie* [p], and from a short paragraph out of his Prolegomena, which Mr. Whiston did me the honour to send me. His words are to this purpose [q]; "St. Matthew's text was the only one of the four Evange-"lists, which I could not always place in my Harmony in that "same order, in which it is in our common copies; because "from the twenty-second verse of the fourth chapter, to the "thirteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter, he differs very "much from the order of the other evangelists. This indeed "seems very strange, when we consider that the evangelist St. "Mark, who seems to be a sort of an epitomizer of him, does "exactly agree with St. Luke and St. John in relating all "those particulars which are now so much transposed in St. "Matthew. This seems very hard to be accounted for, un-"less we suppose it done by some very ancient confusion or "disorder of the sheets (or papers) on which this Gospel was "wrote."

This is the hypothesis of these two learned men: it is strange a proposition, which seems so much to need proof, should by them be taken for granted. This is such a postulatum, as one very seldom meets with; and it will be so far from being granted to Mr. Whiston to be a truth, that needs not to be proved, (viz. that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel on loose scraps of paper,) that it will appear to every impartial examiner to be a most unreasonable supposition. For the

[p] Toutes les évangélistes sont dans l'ordre, auquel ils ont écrit, excepté St. Matthieu, depuis le chap. iv. 22. jusqu'au chap. xiv. 13. parce qu'en cela cet évangéliste s'est éloigné de l'ordre des autres. Mr. Toinard ne sait d'où ce désordre peut être arrivé, à moins que depuis le commencement, les papiers de l'évangéliste n'aient été transposés par quelque accident. Biblioth. Choisie, tom. 15. art. 5. p. 251.

[q] Matthæi solius ex quatuor evangeliis textum, eodem quo in vulgatis legitur ordine, a principio ad finem exhibere non licuit, propterea quod ab aliorum evangelistarum ordine, a capitis quarti evangelii sui versu vicesimo secundo, ad ejusdem evangelii capitis decimi quarti versum decimum tertium, plurimum discedit. Quod sane mirari subit; cum evangelista Marcus, ejus veluti epitomator, cum Luca et Joanne æquo pede in iis omnibus narrandis decurrat, quæ apud Matthæum varie transposita leguntur. Quod unde evenerit, nisi ex perturbatione aliqua eaque antiquissima schedarum evangelistæ hujus, difficile est perspicere. Proleg. p. 5.

manifesting of this, I shall offer the best proof I can; and if it should be thought by any, that I have been at more pains in confuting this hypothesis than was necessary, I desire it may be considered, that my arguing tends not only to overthrow this proposition, about St. Matthew's Gospel being disordered, but may be made use of (at least a good part of it) against Spinoza, Father Simon, and Mr. Whiston's opinion of several books of the Old Testament, which has been mentioned in the preface.

The method I design to proceed in shall be, first, to shew *what the manner of writing among the ancients was*, and particularly, *after what manner the Jews wrote in our Saviour's time;* and from thence shew, how highly absurd it is to imagine that St. Matthew wrote after that manner which Mr. Whiston supposes.

The accounts we have from antiquity of their manner of writing are very defective and imperfect; and it is with no small difficulty and pains, that we are able to say any thing clear on this head. The first and most ancient account that we have of any writing is that which Josephus tells us of the sons of Seth, before the flood; viz. that they "having made "some observations about the heavenly bodies, that they might "not be lost, made two pillars, the one of brick, the other of "stone, on both of which they wrote the discoveries they had "made; &c.[r]" It was after this manner the Decalogue was wrote, viz. *on tables of stone*[s]. In succeeding ages they were wont to write, in several countries, upon leaves of some certain trees, which they found most convenient to their purpose. Pliny tells us, these were made use of for writing "before the "invention of paper, and particularly the leaves of palm-"trees[t]; and that afterwards they wrote upon the inner bark "of some trees." What these trees were, we are informed by that learned antiquary Alexander ab Alexandro[u]. "After-

[r] Σοφίαν τι τὴν περὶ τὰ οὐράνια, καὶ τὴν τούτων διακόσμησιν ἐπεινόησαν· ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ μὴ διαφυγεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰ εὑρημένα— στήλας δύο ποιησάμενοι, τὴν μὲν ἐκ πλίνθου, τὴν δ' ἑτέραν ἐκ λίθων, ἀμφοτέραις ἐνέγραψαν τὰ εὑρημένα, &c. Antiq. Jud. l. 1. c. 2. §. 3.

[s] Exod. xxxi. 18. and xxxii. 16.

[t] Antea non fuisse chartarum usum; palmarum foliis primo scriptitatum, deinde quarundam arborum libris. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 13. c. 11.

[u] Hæ fuere a principio ex cortice platani, fraxini, aceris, populi albæ, item fagi et ulni; aut, sicut Ulpianus censuit, ex tilia, philyra, et papyro.

" wards, they wrote their public records in volumes or rolls of " lead, and their private matters on fine linen and wax," as the same authors tell us [x]; hence Suidas also tells us of writing upon plates or leaves of lead [y]. And this (if I may be allowed to guess) seems to be a method of writing which was in use in the time of Job, as is intimated in these words, ch. xix. 23, 24. *Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! that they were graven with an iron pen and* lead *in the rock for ever!* Hence we read in Suetonius, that Nero made use of a *plumbea charta, a plate of lead*, called *charta*, not only because it was like it in form, but because they used to write not only on paper, but on plates of lead [z].

Afterwards, viz. about the time when Alexander the Great was in Egypt, the *use of paper* was first found out; I do not mean such sort of paper as we now use, but the inner coat or skin of the great Ægyptian rush, which they called *papyrus*, from whence comes our present English word *paper*. The coats or thin skins of this rush, when duly dried and prepared for use, they called *chartæ*. A larger account of the nature of this material for writing the reader may see in the place of Pliny last referred to [a], and concerning the time of its invention, Polydore Vergil [b]. Now if indeed any of those forementioned had been the method of writing in use among the Jews, when St. Matthew wrote his Gospel, there had then been a much better foundation for the conjecture of Mr. Whiston and Mr. Toinard, than there really is. Had it been then the custom to write upon the leaves of palm-trees, or the little skin or inner bark of any other trees, the leaves of their books must have been very small, and consequently must consist of a great number of separate pieces and scraps; and so perhaps, by reason of the difficulty of fastening them together, would

Liber enim interior pars est corticis, quæ ligno cohæret. Alex. ab Alexand. Gen. Dier. l. 2. c. 30.

[x] Pliny, and Alexand. ab Alexand. ibid.

[y] Εἰς ἐλασμοὺς μολύβδων γράφοντες. Suid. ad voc. μόλυβδος.

[z] In Ner. c. 20. Quid autem similius, quam plumbi lamina et chartæ expansæ pagina? quin etiam in plumbi laminis interdum ita scribebant, ut in chartæ paginis. Casaub. ad loc. Vid. Tacit. Annal. l. 2. c. 69.

[a] Priusquam digrediamur ab Ægypto, et papyri natura dicetur, cum chartæ usu maxime humanitas vitæ constet et memoria. Et hanc Alexandri magni victoria repertam auctor est M. Varro, condita in Ægypto Alexandria, &c. Plin. ubi sup.

[b] De Inventor. Rerum, l. 2. c. 8.

be more liable to confusion and misplacing. But it is very certain none of these methods were then in use amongst the Jews. If ever they were in use among them, they had now for a long time been disused, and another more expedient, and far more commodious invented, as will appear in the following chapter.

CHAP. XV.

That St. Matthew did not write his Gospel on small pieces of paper, proved by a large dissertation on the manner in which the ancients wrote their books. The ordinary method was to write on large skins, which were fastened together, and rolled up. This the practice of the Jews long before and in our Saviour's time. The words opened *and* closed the book, Luke iv. 17, 20. *discussed. The words*, Bring the parchments, 2 Tim. iv. 13. *considered. It does not appear that the Jews made use of paper, or any other material besides that mentioned, to write their books upon.*

HAVING in the foregoing chapter premised some short account of the various methods of writing in use among the ancients, I come now to consider that which was of all the most common, viz. *the writing on large skins of parchment, which they rolled up.* This was the way in which the Jews, Greeks, and Romans wrote their books both before and in our Saviour's time; and therefore it is very probable this was the way St. Matthew wrote his Gospel, and not on small scraps or scrolls of paper. For the manifesting of this matter, I will endeavour to shew,

1. That the ancients did very much make use of *parchment, or large skins, to write upon.*

2. That when they had wrote on these, *they were wont to fasten them together, and roll them up.*

3. That the Jews *long before our Saviour's time* did write their books *after this manner.*

4. That the Jews usually wrote thus *about the time when St. Matthew wrote his Gospel.*

These things fully shewn will make the supposition of St.

Matthew's writing his book upon small pieces, or scraps of paper, (some of which would not contain above a line or two,) very absurd and unreasonable.

1. *The ancients did very much use parchment, or large skins, to write upon.* This is a matter of fact so very well known, that there needs not be much said to prove it. Herodotus, who lived above four hundred years before our Saviour's time, mentions it as a very ancient custom among the Ionians; "The Ionians," says he, "have for a long time called their "books skins, because in the scarcity of [Egyptian] paper, "they made use of goat skins, and sheep skins; nay, and even "in our time, many foreign nations write upon such skins [c]." Suidas cites out of some ancient author an account, probably older than the time of Herodotus, in these words [d]; "Her- "mion, writing down their determinations upon skins, sent "them to the enemy." Pliny indeed, out of Varro, gives us an account of the original of this sort of writing on parchment a long time afterwards, viz. in the time of Eumenes; which I think was near three hundred years before our Saviour's time. The account is this [e]; that there being an emulation or strife between Eumenes and Ptolemy concerning their libraries, (viz. whose should be the largest,) the latter being the king of Egypt, forbade the exportation of the Egyptian paper; whereupon Eumenes king of Pergamus first invented the use of parchment, and so from Pergamus that material for writing was called Pergamena. The same account, a little more full, is given us by Alexander ab Alexandro, in the place before cited [f]. I shall not now dispute concerning the time and antiquity of this invention: if it was even so late as Varro's account, it is sufficient for my present purpose; for as soon as it

[c] Καὶ τὰς βίβλους διφθέρας καλέουσι ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ οἱ Ἴωνες, ὅτι κοτὲ ἐν σπάνει βίβλων ἐχρέωντο διφθέρῃσι αἰγειῇσί τε καὶ οἰέῃσι· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πολλοὶ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐς τοιαύτας διφθέρας γράφουσι. l. 5. c. 58. I translate ἐν σπάνει βίβλων, *in the scarcity of Egyptian paper;* because the word commonly signifies so, and nothing else can be meant. So the Latin translator paraphrases it: Βίβλων, i. e. Scirporum; per *biblum* videtur potius intelligenda papyrus Ægypti; though this overthrows Varro's account, that this material for writing was found out when Alexander was in Egypt.

[d] Εἰς διφθέρας γὰρ τὰς διανοίας αὐτῶν γράψας ὁ Ἑρμίων ἔπεμπε τοῖς πολεμίοις. Suid. ad Διφθέρα.

[e] Mox æmulatione circa bibliothecas regum Ptolemæi et Eumenis, supprimente chartas Ptolemæo, idem Varro membranas Pergami tradidit repertas. Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 13. c. 11.

[f] Genial. Dier. l. 2. c. 30.

was found out, the use of it became very common [g]; although I rather incline to think Varro's story not to be true as to the time, as Polydore Vergil has well observed [h]; and Dr. Edwards [i], and after him Dr. Prideaux [k] have more largely proved.

2. When they had wrote upon these skins of parchment, *they were wont to fasten them together, and roll them up.* They did not cut the parchment into small pieces, as we now do our books; but all the book was wrote on one long continued page, consisting of several skins fastened together. To the end of the skins was fastened a large staff or stick, round about which they rolled up the skins: this, when so rolled up, they called *volumen, a volvendo*, i. e. a *volume* or *roll*, and the staff about which it was rolled they called *umbilicus*. And hence we so frequently in the Roman authors meet with *membranæ*, for the material on which they wrote, *volumen*, for the book itself when wrote, and *ad umbilicum ducere*, to come to the end of the book [l]. So Martial, in the last epigram of his fourth book, speaking to his book, says,

Ohe jam satis est, ohe libelle,
Jam pervenimus usque ad umbilicos.

And, in another place [m], says of his book,

Pictis luxurieris umbilicis.

So also when he is speaking to a plagiary, that had stole his poems, he tells him [n], he should have rather made choice of a more obscure book:

Nec umbilicis cultus atque membrana[o].

I will not be at the pains to collect any more instances for

[g] Postea promiscue patuit usus rei, qua constat hominum immortalitas Plin. ibid.

[h] Verum ego affirmarem membranas, multo ante quam tradit Varro, esse repertas. De Inventoribus Rer. l. 2. c. 8.

[i] Of the Authority and Style of the Holy Scriptures, vol. 2. c. 3.

[k] Connect. of the History of the Old and New Testament, vol. 1. b. 7.

[l] Veteres enim non solum Hebræi, sed et ethnici, scribere solebant in membranis aut chartis, quæ in rotundum complicabantur—Apud ethnicos voluminum fuisse usum satis indicat proverbium illud, *Ad umbilicum ducere*. Erat enim umbilicus lignum, circa quod chartæ descriptæ convolvebantur. Jansen. ad Psal. xxxix. 11.

[m] Lib. 3. Epig. 2.

[n] Lib. 1. Epig. 67.

[o] *Nec umbilicis cultus*, i. e. cujus umbilicus, is est bacillus cedrinus, buxeus, cupressinus, &c. extremæ paginæ, absoluto jam opere, assutus; vel umbilici extremitates, quæ, complicatis in volumen membranis, utrinque apparent, cornua appellantur, ebore, argento, vel auro ornantur. Farnab. ad loc. See also l. 5. Epig. 6.

the proof of this matter. It is sufficiently known to those who are versed at all in antiquity, and will more fully appear, when we consider,

3. *That the Jews, long before our Saviour's time, did write their books after this manner.* There cannot be the least doubt but the Jews, as well as other nations, did make use of the skins of several animals to write upon, long before that period we mentioned; for Aristæas, in his History of the Translation of the Bible by the Seventy, tells us [p], that Ptolemy sent messengers to Eleazar the high priest for the Jewish law, "because they had it wrote in skins, or parchment, in Hebrew "letters." Josephus also, who relates the same history, tells us, that when the seventy-two elders were come down to Egypt, they came with presents to the king, and the parchments, in which they had the law, wrote in letters of gold; that when they were unfolding the books, and shewing them to the king, he was surprised at the fineness or thinness of the parchment, and that they were so sewed or fastened together, that it was impossible to perceive the seams, or the place where one skin was fastened to another [q]. Whether the history of Aristæas, and this chapter of Josephus, be true or not, I need not inquire; the world has been sufficiently troubled with that dispute already. There have been some, who have even made the place of Josephus now cited an argument against this history. Rivet, for instance [r], would persuade us, that the Jews never would write their law in golden letters; and the very learned Chamier [s] calls the story of Ptolemy's admiring the fineness of the parchment, a λεπτολογία or μικροφιλοτιμία; he means that it is an idle story, which deserves no credit. But, as I said, I need not dispute the truth of the story; I take it for granted that Aristæas, or whoever he was that was the author of that history under his name, lived before our Saviour's

[p] Διὰ τὰ γράφεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν διφθέραις, Ἑβραικοῖς γράμμασιν. In init.

[q] Τῶν διφθερῶν, αἷς ἐγγεγραμμένους εἶχον τοὺς νόμους χρυσοῖς γράμμασιν—ὡς δ' ἀποκαλύψαντες τῶν ἐνειλημάτων ἐπέδειξαν αὐτῷ, θαυμάσας ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς ἰσχνότητος τοὺς ὑμένας (I think it would be better to read τοῦ ὑμένος), καὶ τῆς συμβολῆς τὸ ἀνεπίγνωστον, οὕτω γὰρ ἥρμοστο, &c. Antiq. Jud. lib. 12. c. 2. §. 10.

[r] Isagog. ad Script. Sacr. c. 10. For this his opinion, he depends only upon a fable of the rabbins, that the Law was to be wrote only with ink of such a sort.

[s] Panstrat. Cathol. vol. 1. l. 13. c. 4. §. 11.

time. Dr. Hody [t] himself owns it, and has endeavoured to prove it; and if so, let the history be supposed never so false, yet it cannot be supposed a person would write of a custom which never had been. The same may be said also of the passage cited out of Josephus; viz. that he believed this was the method of writing among the Jews, in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, almost three hundred years before our Saviour's time. It is worth our observing, that the most ancient Jews, as well as Josephus, were of this opinion, that the old way of writing the law was upon parchment; hence the Chaldee paraphrast, supposed by the Jews to be Jonathan, (who wrote the Targum on the prophets, and lived in or before our Saviour's time,) says in his translation of these words, Deut. xxxi. 24. that Moses wrote the law על ספרא *upon parchment.* Whether this be so or not, is very uncertain. Dr. Prideaux [u], it seems, is of the same opinion; "It must," says he, "be ac- "knowledged, that the authentic copy of the law, which Hil- "kiah found in the temple, and sent to king Josiah, was of "this material, none other used for writing being of so durable "a nature as to last from Moses's time till then, which was "eight hundred and thirty years." However the matter of fact be, I will not now inquire; only observe, by the by, the insufficiency of the dean's argument; for,

1. It is far from being evident, that the book which Hilkiah found was that which was wrote by Moses. We are told expressly, that when Solomon, at the dedication of the temple, brought up the ark, there was nothing found in it *but the two tables of stone* which Moses had put there, 1 Kings viii. 9.

2. Suppose it was the book wrote by Moses, it does not follow that it was of parchment because it lasted so long; for the other materials of writing, made use of by the ancients, were no less durable than this. A deep incision into brass, lead, stone, or perhaps wax, was, if duly preserved, likely to last as long as any sort of ink on parchment. Moses's tables of stone, we are assured, were in being at the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 9, (which was the space of almost five hundred years,) and very probably continued to the destruction of it;

[t] Contra Histor. Aristeæ de LXX. Interpret. cap. 20.

[u] Connect. of the Hist. of the Old Test. part 1. b. 7. in fin.

and other monuments of antiquity have continued legible a much longer time.

But to return, it is evident from what has been said, that the Jews before our Saviour's time did write upon parchment, or the skins of animals. I am now further to shew, that they made their books after the manner that has been described, viz. by rolling the skins upon a staff, when they were fastened together. Now inasmuch as we have few (if any at all besides the canonical ones of the Old Testament) of the books of the Jews, that were wrote before our Saviour's time, it is impossible to give so clear an account of their way of writing, as of the heathens, whose books we have. Besides those testimonies of Josephus, Aristæas, and Jonathan, I know not any. Some intimations of this matter in the Old Testament indeed there are, which, if duly considered, will evidence to us the manner of their writing. For instance, it is apparent that the Jewish books were rolled up, from the name given them in the Old Testament: as the Romans made use of the word *volumen* (*a volvendo*, from its being rolled up) to denote a *book;* so the Jews made use of the words מגלה and גליון, which signify the very same as *volumen*, derived from גלל *to roll*. The last of these words we find Isai. viii. 1. God commands the prophet to take גדול גליון, *a large roll*, and write therein, &c. The former we meet with several times in the prophets[x], sometimes joined with the word ספר, *a book*, and sometimes not. It occurs once in the Psalms, viz. xl. 7. *as it is written concerning me in the volume of thy book*, ספר במגלת, i. e. *in convolutione libri*, or, according to a very common and known Hebraism, *in libro convoluto*, i. e. "in the book that is rolled "up," as the book of the law then was. This interpretation is plain, and I need not be at the pains to cite the critics and commentators to support it; I think they almost all agree that this word was made use of to signify a book[y], because their books were rolled up, and so we have traced this custom as far as David's time. I must not omit observing here, that the Seventy seem to have understood this place otherwise, when

[x] Jer. xxxvi. 2, 14, 20, &c. Ezek. ii. 9. and iii. 1, 2, 3. Zech. v. 1, 2.

[y] Vid. Jansen. Genebrard. &c. ad loc. Sixt. Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. l. 2. ad voc. Volumen. Castell. Buxtorf. et Schindler ad גלל. See Isai. xxxiv. 4.

they translate it, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου, and that the old Latin translator after them renders it, *in capite libri;* which has made some popish commentators believe that we are to understand, *the sum of the book.* But it does not much concern us how the Seventy have rendered it, nor indeed should I have mentioned it, if St. Paul had not seemed to justify their translation, by making use of their words, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου, &c. Heb. x. 7. I said, *seemed to justify;* for though St. Paul, and other writers of the New Testament, did undoubtedly make use of the Septuagint, or some Greek translation, in citing out of the Old Testament; yet their using it does not always justify it, as though it were a just translation of the original. It is certain the writers of the New Testament made use of the Greek version sometimes, where the translators plainly mistook the words they translated; and the reason why they thus followed them in their mistakes was, because they wrote to and for those who made use of these Bibles; and it might probably have been of very bad consequence had they gone about to correct or alter them [z]. But perhaps after all, מגלת סמר may be justly translated by the Seventy, κεφαλὶς βιβλίου, and κεφαλὶς may signify the very same thing as *volume.* So our learned countryman, Mr. Fuller, has by an ingenious criticism endeavoured to prove [a]. I would only observe further here, that Aquila and Symmachus translate this word in its just sense, *a roll,* and so Theodoret understood it [b], and the Seventy themselves have very frequently translated this word מגלה proves, that the Jews before our Saviour's time were wont to roll up their books. I add,

χαρτίον [c]. I shall take it then for granted, that the word

4. That the Jews usually wrote thus *about the time when St. Matthew wrote his Gospel.* That it was thus in our Saviour's time seems to be very evident from those words, Luke iv. 17. *And when he had opened the book,* &c. and ver.

[z] See concerning this matter Rivet. Isagog. in S. Script. c. 10. and Flacc. Illyric. par. 2. tract. 1. de Evangelist.

[a] Miscell. Sacr. l. 2. c. 10.

[b] Τὴν κεφαλίδα εἴλημα εἰρήκασιν Ἀκύλας καὶ ὁ Σύμμαχος· οὕτω δὲ τὰς θείας γραφὰς μίχρι καὶ τήμερον Ἰουδαῖοι κατασκευάζειν εἰώθασι. Theodoret. ad Psal. xl. 8. Idem, in Ezek. iii. κεφαλίδα καλεῖ τὰ εἰλητὰ βιβλία. Apud Suicer. in Thesaur. ad κεφαλίς. Vid. et Var. Lect. et Schol. in LXX. Hence Suidas also, at the word Κεφαλίς. Τὴν κεφαλίδα, ὅπερ τινὲς εἴλημά φασιν.

[c] Jer. xxxvi.

20. *And he closed the book*, &c. The two Greek words, ἀναπτύξας and πτύξας, translated *opened* and *closed*, do evidently intimate to us, what sort of a book it was in which our Saviour read. They signify to *unfold*, and to *fold up again*, or (if I may use the word) to *unroll* and to *roll up again*, as every body knows who has met with these words in the Greek authors; and so here ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον meaneth his taking the parchment off the roll, and drawing it out in length to read it, and πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον means his rolling it up again round the staff. "The word ἀναπτύσσω," says a learned critic [d], "refers "to the manner of writing among the Jews, which was not in "parchment or paper sewed together, as we now use, but in "one continued page or long roll, and that folded up, to save "it from dust or other harm." In this sense also the word is used by the LXX. 2 Kings xix. 14. Hezekiah received the letter, or *little books*, τὰ βιβλία, (as the LXX translate the word הספרים,) καὶ ἀνεπτύξεν αὐτὰ, *and spread them*, or *laid them open*. Hence it was well observed by Grotius, that these two words answer to the Latin ones *evolvere* and *convolvere*, i. e. *to fold* and *unfold* [e]; and I would observe, that the Greek word πτύσσω was so very commonly used for this sort of *folding* and *rolling up* their books; that, as the Jews called their books מגלת, from their being thus rolled up, and the Romans called theirs *volumina* for the same reason; so, upon the very same account, the Greeks formed the words πτῦγμα and πτυκτίον, πυκτὶς and πυκτίον, to denote a book, or a writing on parchment, that was thus folded or rolled up [f]: hence θεῖα πυκτὶς is often used by the Greek fathers for the sacred scripture [g]. From all which I think it is very fair to conclude, that the book which our Saviour read in the synagogue at Nazareth was of that sort which has been described, viz. a *volume of parchment*.

The matter I am upon may receive some confirmation from

[d] Dr. Hammond on Luke iv. 17.

[e] Ἀναπτύσσειν βιβλίον est *evolvere*, πτύσσειν *convolvere*. Jam Hebræorum, ut et Latinorum, libri erant volumina; hinc *evolvere librum* apud Ciceronem, atque alios: idem est *revolvere* Livio et Martiali, qua voce et hic usus est recte Latinus interpres. Grot. ad loc. See Beza, Chemnit. Cornel. ad Lapid. Le Clerc, Whitby, &c. ad loc.

[f] Πυκτίον, τὸ βιβλίον, Suid. ad voc.

[g] Sacra Scriptura hac voce (scil. Πυκτὶς) sæpe designatur. Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. ad voc.

St. Paul's charge to Timothy [h]; *The cloke that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.* I will not now inquire whether the word φαιλόνην, which we have translated a *cloke*, signifies a parchment roll or not. According to Phavorinus it does [i]; and I can see no reason why our translators should render it a *cloke*, but because Beza (whom they continually followed, and often even in his mistakes) had done so before them. Whether this signifies a parchment roll or no, there can be little reason to doubt but μεμβράνας does. Dr. Edwards has somewhere told us, that he supposes the parchments here mean the skins, which the apostle made use of in his trade of tent-making; but there is not the least foundation for this fancy. It would seem indeed at first that the parchments and books, which St. Paul desires him to bring, were distinct things; but there is no need at all of supposing so. The apostle seems here to make use of a form of speech, very common in the scriptures and all language; viz. repeating the same thing in different words; *Bring the little chest* (or *sachel*, for so I take the word φαιλόνην) *which I left at Troas, and the books; but especially the parchments*, i. e. *the books.* The old Syriac interpreter translates the word φαιλόνην, which we translate a *cloke*, בית כתבא, i. e. *a chest of books or writings*, and μεμβράνας, which we translate *parchments*, he renders כרכא דמגלא, i. e. *a bundle of parchment rolls.* The Syriac word here is the very same with the Hebrew one, of which we have spoke already; so that, whether St. Paul here meant *parchment rolls* or not, it is certain the Syriac interpreter, who lived about that time, (as will be hereafter proved,) thought he did; which is sufficient to my present purpose.

Another place of the New Testament, from whence we may conclude that to have been the method of writing in use among the Jews, which has been described, viz. on parchment rolls, is that, Rev. vi. 14. *The heaven departed as a scroll, when it is rolled together*, &c. The original word, which we have translated *a scroll*, is βιβλίον, *a book*; and so here is a

[h] 2 Tim. iv. 13.

[i] Vid. Heins. Exerc. Sacr. ad loc. and Dr. Hammond, who also takes it in this sense. Jerome also tells us, that some in his time understood by φαιλόνην, Volumen Hebraicum. Ad Damas. Quæst. 2.

manifest allusion to the custom of rolling up their books or parchments, on which they wrote at that time[k].

I shall not seek for any further proofs of this matter, only would observe, that there is a passage in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians, which if it do not prove the point in hand, yet may itself be explained from what has been said. In the close of his Epistle, he tells the Philippians, that the Epistles of Ignatius ὑποτεταγμέναι εἰσὶ, were annexed or subjoined (*subjectæ sunt* according to the old Latin version) to his own Epistle. This seems capable of no other meaning, than *that at the end or bottom of the roll, on which his epistle was wrote, were fastened together the skins, on which Ignatius's were wrote.*

And thus I have largely considered, what the method of writing was among the Jews before our Saviour's time, and about that time when St. Matthew wrote; and now, I think, I may justly draw my conclusion, that St. Matthew did not write his Gospel on small scraps or scrolls of paper. Why should he write in a method so very different from all his cotemporaries? If every one else wrote on large skins of parchment, is it credible that he would write upon small scraps of paper, or of any other material whatsoever? As for the Egyptian paper, it is a very great question whether it was ever in use among the Jews at all. I have not yet seen any reason to believe that it was; there is not, that I know of, the least intimation of any such thing, either in the Old or New Testament, or Josephus. But let us take it for granted that the Jews, as well as other nations, did make use of this sort of paper, it will not follow that St. Matthew had any need to write his Gospel on small pieces or scraps of it. I am very apt to think that the size of this paper was as large as that which we now ordinarily make use of. We read several times in ancient writers, of ships or boats made of this papyrus; "They make "boats of papyrus, and sails of its bark," says Pliny[l]; and in another place he mentions *naves papyraceas* [m], *ships made of papyrus:* Plutarch also talks of παπύρινα σκάφη, *boats of papyrus* [n].

[k] There is the very same allusion or comparison, Isai. xxxiv. 4.

[l] Ex papyro navigia texunt, et e libro vela. Hist. Natur. l. 13. c. 11.

[m] L. 6. c. 22.

[n] In Lib. de Is. et Osir. apud Doughteium in Analect. Sacr. Excurs. 156. where other like instances are produced.

I cannot omit mentioning here the opinion of several learned men, that the ark or boat into which Moses was put on the river in Egypt was made of this papyrus. So Grotius, *fiscellam scirpeam*, i. e. *ex papyro ;* and, to confirm his interpretation, he cites this verse of Lucan, lib. 4. v. 136 [o].

Conseritur bibula Memphitis cymba papyro.

This opinion seems to be confirmed from those words of the prophet, Isai. xviii. 1, 2. *Woe to the land shadowing with wings, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia ; that sendeth ambassadors by the sea, even in vessels of bulrushes upon the waters.* Here we not only read of vessels made of bulrushes in or near Egypt, but what is very observable, the same word is put here to denote that of which these vessels were made, ובכלי גמא, which is used to denote that of which Moses's ark was made, תבת גמא, Exod. ii. 3. So then, if the Egyptian papyrus was thus large, though the Jews did use it, yet it is not at all likely St. Matthew would write upon small scraps and scrolls ; especially if we consider how *very small and many* these scraps and scrolls were ; which shall be the subject of the following chapter.

After all that has been said in this chapter, I confess there might have been some other methods of writing in use among the Jews in our Saviour's time. There is another way mentioned by St. Luke, chap. i. 63. *And he asked for a writing-table, and wrote,* &c. What sort of writing-table this was, and what the proper meaning of the word πινακίδιον here is, seems not very easy to be told. Tertullian [p], and after him several others [q], suppose it to be a *wax-table :* whether this opinion be true or not, I cannot determine. The Romans were wont to write their letters, and other smaller matters, on such tables ; perhaps Zacharias might write on such a one, and perhaps it might be on a little thin stone table, such as we now commonly use. Yet neither of these was the material of which their books were composed ; and I remember Tully mentions *the transferring the contents of these sort of tables*

[o] Annot. ad Exod. ii. 3.

[p] At enim Zacharias temporali vocis orbatione mulctatus—manibus suis a corde dictat, et nomen filii sine ore pronuntiat ; loquitur in stylo, auditur in cera, &c. Lib. de Idololat. c. 23.

[q] Erasmus, Gualtperius, Heinsius, et alii, ad loc.

into books [r]. Their books and their tables were therefore different. Besides this, I do not find there is in the sacred writings, or any where else, any intimation of another method of writing in use among the Jews about this time; and therefore, since it has been proved to be the ordinary method of the Jews to write their books on long rolls of parchment, I conclude St. Matthew also wrote his Gospel so, and not, as Mr. Whiston says, upon small pieces of paper; which will more fully appear in the following chapter.

CHAP. XVI.

Mr. Whiston's strange supposition, of St. Matthew's writing this part of his Gospel on small pieces of paper, confuted from the consideration of their number and unequal size. A table of them, by which it appears that they were at least twenty in number, of very different sizes. Some contained several chapters, others but a few verses, others but one verse. The improbability of St. Matthew's writing thus. The size of the parchment rolls on which the Jews wrote.

THE improbability of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel upon small pieces of paper (as Mr. Whiston supposes he did) will appear much greater, if we consider the *number and size of these several papers.*

It is an old and true saying of the philosopher, Ἑνὸς ἀτόπου δοθέντος, πολλὰ ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι συμβαίνειν; "One absurdity advanced necessarily leads a person into many others to maintain it." For as truth needs not to be, nor indeed can be, supported by that which is false; so that which is false cannot be supported by any thing which is true. A strange fondness to be reputed the authors of some new discovery, and a great unwillingness to be of the same opinion with the greatest part of the world, often betrays very learned men into those absurdities, which else they would never have fallen into or maintained. I do not say, nor do I believe, this was the

[r] Literæ, lituræque omnes assimulatæ, expressæ, de tabulis in libros transferuntur. Orat. vii. in Verrem, vers. fin.

case with Mr. Whiston; and yet I cannot but think, that it was a too great zeal for his new opinion, which hindered him from seeing the consequences of it: nothing else could have prevented a genius so penetrating, from discovering those consequences of his opinion which I am now about to observe.

His hypothesis (as has been said already) is, *that the several parts or periods of this former part of St. Matthew's Gospel were written at first separately, and upon several distinct papers; which were put together in their present order by those who did not perfectly know the true series of the history.* So then every one of the transposed and misplaced branches, be it larger or lesser, was written on a distinct separate piece of paper. Now there can be no better argument to confute this hypothesis, than the consideration of the *size* and *number* of these papers. Upon due examination we shall find the number to be no less than *twenty*, in this small part of the history, of *very different and unequal sizes*, as will appear by the following table made out of Mr. Whiston's Harmony.

A Table of the several distinct papers, on which, according to Mr. Whiston, St. Matthew at first wrote his Gospel, with the number of verses, of which each part or paper did consist.

N. B. I have in this table observed the order of Mr. Whiston's Harmony.

The papers on which St. Matthew wrote, since misplaced.	The number of verses of which each paper did consist.
1. Ch. viii. 14—17.	1. Four verses.
2. viii. 2—4.	2. Three verses.
3. ix. 2.—17.	3. Sixteen verses.
4. xii. 1—21.	4. Twenty-one verses.
5. iv. 23—25. and v. 1.	5. Four verses.
6. viii. 1.	6. One verse.
7. v. 2, &c. vi. and vii.	7. A hundred and ten verses.
8. viii. 5—13.	8. Nine verses.
9. xi. 2. to the end.	9. Twenty-nine verses.
10. xii. 22—50. and xiii. 1—53.	10. Eighty-one verses.
11. viii. 18.	11. One verse.

The papers on which St. Matthew wrote, since misplaced.		The number of verses of which each paper did consist.
12.	viii. 23—34. and ix. 1.	12. Thirteen verses.
13.	viii. 19—22.	13. Four verses.
14.	ix. 18—34.	14. Seventeen verses.
15.	xiii. 54—58.	15. Five verses.
16.	ix. 35—38. and x. and xi. 1.	16. Forty-seven verses.

These are the several parts of St. Matthew's Gospel which Mr. Whiston supposes misplaced; besides these, there is also another branch in the former part of this Gospel, which he has in his Harmony placed contrary to the order of our present copies; and consequently must, according to this hypothesis, be misplaced, and so also be wrote upon a separate and distinct piece of paper. That which I mean is the account of our Lord's temptation by the Devil in the mountain, chap. iv. 8, &c. This evidently implies the dislocation of two other branches, and consequently their being wrote also on separate pieces of paper. These papers, and the number of verses are,

17. Ch. iv. 8—11.	17. Three verses.
18. and ver. 5—8.	18. Three verses.
19. and ver. 12—22.	19. Twelve verses.

Thus it is evident that, according to Mr. Whiston, St. Matthew must have wrote this former part of his Gospel *upon twenty several pieces of paper;* although we suppose that the three first chapters, and the four first verses of the fourth, were all wrote upon one. But is this a thing credible? especially if we look upon the foregoing table, and see of what very different sizes these papers were, some to contain *two or three long chapters*, others only *two or three short verses*, and others only *one*. What reason can possibly be assigned, why this inspired apostle should write after this manner? I remember Diogenes Laertius, in the Life of Cleanthes, tells us[s], that that philosopher "being poor, and wanting money to buy pa-

[s] Τοῦτόν φασιν εἰς ὄστρακα καὶ βοῶν ὠμοπλάτας γράφειν, ἅπερ ἥκουε παρὰ τοῦ Ζήνωνος, ἀπορίᾳ μεμάτων ὥστε ὠνήσασθαι χαρτία. Diog. Laert. in Vit. Cleant. §. 174.

" per, was wont to write the lectures and discourses of his " master Zeno on small shells or bones of oxen." But however poor our Saviour's apostles were, we can hardly suppose them forced to any such necessity as this: St. Matthew certainly was able to procure a few skins of parchment to write his Gospel upon; and, if he was, nothing can excuse him for writing it as Mr. Whiston supposes. He could not but foresee his Gospel so wrote must be liable to confusion and dislocation; and can it be supposed, that an inspired writer would have no more regard to that which was dictated to him by God's holy Spirit? would he be so unaccountably careless in writing that which was designed for the benefit of mankind in all ages of the world? A person of an ordinary capacity, in writing a common book, cannot be supposed to have wrote after such a manner, and much less *an accurate writer under the conduct of divine inspiration*, (as Mr. Whiston allows St. Matthew to have been,) in writing one of the most useful books, and of the most important consequence to the world, that ever was wrote.

The foregoing reasoning may (if indeed it needed any) receive some confirmation from the consideration of St. Matthew's character; *he was a publican*, and therefore more likely to be exact and accurate in his writing than others. The publicans were custom-house officers, whose business was to take an account of the importation and exportation of goods, and to collect the money or duty which was laid upon them. For this purpose they had (as Cicero tells us [t]) their *tabulas accepti et expensi*, which were very exact *accounts of what they expended and what they received*, and were upon proper occasions (if not always) *transferred into books, and transmitted to Rome* [u]. Of this occupation was St. Matthew, one whose business was writing; and is it at all probable that such a one would write after the manner Mr. Whiston supposes? If he was no more careful in the keeping of his accounts, than this supposes him to be in writing his Gospel, truly he was but a very bad officer.

It may not be improper, before I conclude this argument, to shew somewhat of the *size of these parchment rolls on*

[t] Orat. in Verr. 7. §. 186. [u] Cicer. ibid. vers. fin.

which the Jews were wont to write; that so comparing these with those pieces of paper, on which Mr. Whiston supposes St. Matthew to have wrote, that supposition may appear the more unreasonable.

It is very certain these rolls were of very different sizes; the prophet Isaiah was commanded to prepare *a great roll*, chap. viii. 1. and Jeremiah prepared such a one, as contained *all the prophecies God had spoke by him against Israel and Judah, from the days of Josiah unto that time*, chap. xxxvi. 2. i. e. as many as he had received in the space of *twenty-three years*, as appears by the chronology, and chap. xxv. 3. Josephus, when he had finished his history of the Jewish Antiquities, says, it was βιβλίοις μὲν εἴκοσι περιειλημένην, "folded up in twenty volumes " or books." The expression (if I do not mistake it) seems to imply, that each of these books was a distinct volume; and so every one of them was of a larger size than the whole of St. Matthew's Gospel would have made. He adds further, that these twenty books contained sixty thousand στίχοι or *lines;* and since these books were most of them contrived by the author to be pretty near of a size, we may conclude that, one with another, each of these volumes contained about three thousand lines; and such volumes must needs[x] contain a great many skins of parchment.

Maimonides out of the Talmud tells us, that the parchments, on which the Jews wrote their Bibles, were to be six hands in breadth, and six in length[y]; and so the present Jews, retaining the old custom of their nation, write the law which they use in their synagogues in one such large volume[z]. And if Father Simon is to be believed, the Jews have not altered the ancient custom, but have just such volumes in their synagogues now as formerly they had. There is a controversy between that father and the learned Isaac Vossius on that head; the former contending, that " the Pentateuch, or five

[x] After a computation of the number of lines in one of the closest of our printed editions in folio, in which the Greek taketh the whole breadth of the page, I find the number of lines in the print does not amount to very much above a third part of the number of lines that were in Josephus's own manuscript.

[y] Vide Leusden. Dissert. 34. de Pentateuch. Manuscriptis, p. 399. and Dr. Prideaux's Connection of the Hist. of the Old and New Test. part 1. b. 5.

[z] Vid. Leusden. loc. cit.

" books of Moses, did all make but one volume ;" the latter, " that they were as many volumes as books." The former asserts, " they were one volume in the time of Christ ;" the latter says, " the contrary is evident from the history of Aristæas, " which mentions the law as written in several volumes ;" and adds, " that of the infinite number of books there are in the " world divided into volumes, there is not one in all antiquity " which can be evidenced to have been as big a volume as " half the Pentateuch would have made." He concludes asserting the present synagogue books to be " more for show " than for use, &c.[a]" It does not seem very material, which of these learned gentlemen was in the right ; either of their opinions, being supposed true, sufficiently evidences the absurdity of imagining St. Matthew to have wrote so small a part of his Gospel on so many pieces of paper as have been mentioned.

Thus I have endeavoured to shew the unreasonableness of supposing St. Matthew to have wrote after that manner, which Mr. Whiston supposes : after the closest consideration of the matter, I am not able to conceive of any thing which could be the motive or reason of St. Matthew's writing thus. Perhaps it may be said, he wrote down his accounts of matters as they came to pass, lest they should slip his memory ; but this supposition is upon many accounts groundless and false, several of these things having come to pass before St. Matthew was called, and almost all the parts or periods so introduced, as to imply a connection (though not in point of time) with the preceding and following parts of the history. But a fuller answer to this opinion I do not think myself yet obliged to make ; only would refer the reader to the foregoing table.

As to the hints which Mr. Whiston proposes, to restore these disordered parts to their true order again, I cannot think, that, besides what has been already said, they require any particular consideration. I would only make this one remark from them, viz. that he, who did transpose them, must be one that was very well acquainted with the Gospel history ; and

[a] Cum infiniti supersint libri in volumina distincti, vel unum in tota antiquitate ostendatur volumen, quod ad tantam excrescat molem, ut vel dimidiam librorum Moysis partem exæquet. Voss. Respons. ad Iterat. P. Simon. Object. p. 371. et ejusdem Respons. ad tertias Simon. Object. p. 95.

such a one could not possibly make such blunders as these. But I leave this, and the more particular consideration of this matter, to those who shall judge it necessary.

CHAP. XVII.

Mr. Whiston's observation, that our present Greek copies of this Gospel are a translation out of Hebrew, and for that reason more liable to the disorder, which he supposes, considered. St. Matthew did not write his Gospel in Hebrew, though it is asserted by all the fathers. The fathers have frequently (one after another) fallen into the same mistake in matters of fact. How they came to fall into this mistake, viz. by taking the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites for the true authentic Gospel of St. Matthew. The fathers were under a sort of necessity of believing this mistake.

THE remaining part of what Mr. Whiston says, to establish his proposition, consists of an observation or two, which he imagined would make it appear more probable, and give some light in this matter to some future inquiries; and a vindication of himself *from such censures, as the strangeness of the proposition would occasion*[b].

The two observations which Mr. Whiston makes are, he says, instead of some conjectures which he once designed to have offered, how these sections came to be so strangely transposed. It is to be lamented, that any thing should have been the unhappy means of preventing so good a design. Mr. Whiston's zeal for truth, and his indefatigable endeavours to find it out, persuade me, that nothing but the impossibility of accomplishing his design would have prevented him in pursuing it. For my part, (as I have already said,) I cannot see any other way of accounting for the disorder, than that which Mr. Whiston and Mr. Toinard have taken, and which has been considered in the two foregoing chapters.

I proceed now to consider Mr. Whiston's two observations; the first is this, viz. "The present copies of St. Matthew are

[b] Pag. 111.

" only a translation from the Hebrew, (in which language all " antiquity affirm that Gospel was written,) and may therefore " more probably have been subject to some confusion and dis- " order than any of the rest, whose own copies we still have in " the same language wherein they were originally written by " their authors."

This observation of Mr. Whiston's will appear to be no support to his hypothesis, when the two following propositions are duly considered.

1. *That St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, is not a translation out of Hebrew, but the original Greek itself, in which that evangelist wrote.*

2. *Supposing our present Greek copies are a translation out of Hebrew, yet they were not, for that reason, at all the more likely to suffer any such dislocations or disorder, as Mr. Whiston supposes.*

1. *St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, is not a translation out of Hebrew, but the original Greek itself, in which that evangelist wrote.* I own indeed with Mr. Whiston, *that all antiquity hath affirmed this:* I cannot find that so much as any one of the ancients did believe this Gospel originally wrote in Greek. Papias [c], Irenæus [d], Origen [e], Jerome [f], Austin [g], Eusebius [h], Theophylact [i], and several others [k], do all agree to assure us, that this Gospel was originally wrote in Hebrew. I shall not go about particularly to consider each of these testimonies; Dr. Whitby has already done this, as to the most considerable of them [l], in his Prefatory Discourse to the Four Evangelists: instead of this, I will make a few observations, which may help to give some light into this matter.

1. It is certain that a great many of the fathers have fallen into the same mistake, not only in matters of mere speculation, (which was very common,) but also in matters of fact. Every one, who is at all acquainted with the popish controversial

[c] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.
[d] Adv. Hæres. l. 3. c. 1.
[e] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.
[f] Procm. in Comment. Sup. Matth. et in Catalog. Scriptor. Eccl. ad voc. Matth.
[g] De Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. 2.
[h] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24.
[i] Præfat. in Matth.
[k] There are several others (viz. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, &c.) cited by Du Pin in his Hist. of the Canon of the New Test. vol. 2. c. 2. §. 3. but I have them not.
[l] Sect. 5.

writings, will easily admit this observation to be true. It is common in them to meet with a great body of fathers, cited to support the most apparent falsehoods. A persuasion that the scriptures of the Old Testament were corrupted by the Jews, prevailed very much among the fathers, though a notorious falsehood: and Dr. Whitby, in his Treatise of Traditions, has shewed, that "the fathers have been imposed upon by the "Jews in other things, received from them by tradition, and "asserted by more testimonies of ancient fathers, than are "vouched to prove that the Gospel according to St. Matthew "was first written in Hebrew. So, for instance, they do a "great many of them relate the story of the seventy transla-"tors of the Greek Bible making their translation in so many "cells, which is a mere fable." For a further confirmation of this matter, I shall think it sufficient to refer the reader to that excellent treatise of Mr. Daillé, Concerning the Right Use of the Fathers [m].

It may here be objected, that I myself have made use of their testimony, to prove the manner in which St. Mark's Gospel was wrote [n].

To this I only answer, that in such cases, where there can be no objection made against any particular testimony, nor any probable reason assigned why they should fall into such mistake, we ought certainly to believe them. The former was the case in respect of the writing of St. Mark's Gospel; the latter is the case in the matter now under consideration, as will appear by what follows.

2. Though we suppose it a mistake that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, it was almost impossible that a great number of the fathers should not fall into it. Although it was originally wrote in Greek, it had been very strange if many of the fathers had not believed it to be wrote in Hebrew. However like a paradox this may seem, I doubt not but to make it appear very probable by the following observations.

Obs. I. That the Nazarenes or Ebionites, two very early sects among the Christians, had a Gospel which they made

[m] See especially part 2. c. 3. [n] Page 161.

use of, called The Gospel according to the Hebrews[o]. Though they were certainly two different sects, (and *not the same persons*, as Mr. Toland, according to his old way of blundering, would have them to be[p],) yet the difference between their Gospels was not very great: some difference it seems there was, for the Gospel of the Nazarenes *was most full and entire in Hebrew*, but the Gospel of the Ebionites was *adulterated and imperfect*, if Epiphanius be to be credited in this matter[q]; but according to Jerome, they seem to have been the same Gospel[r], for he speaks of the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites as *one*, *which*, says he, *I translated into Greek*.

2. This their Gospel was wrote in Hebrew, or rather, that which was then the language of the Jews, Syriac or Syro-Chaldaic. This is evident from the passages in Jerome and Epiphanius just cited. The former of whom tells us in another place, "that there was a Hebrew copy even in his time "in the library at Cæsarea;" and adds, "that he himself had "the liberty granted him by the Nazarenes that lived at "Berea to transcribe their copy." It is thought by some that the Hebrew copy, which was at Cæsarea, was judged by Jerome to be St. Matthew's own manuscript; but there is not any foundation for this opinion in that father's words[s].

3. This Hebrew Gospel, which the Nazarenes and Ebionites made use of, they believed, and consequently declared to be the true Gospel which St. Matthew wrote. This is evident by their putting so great a value upon it, *as to reject all the others, and to make use only of this*[t]. Hence Eusebius

[o] Ἔχουσι δὲ (scil. Nazaræi) τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστὶ, Epiphan. Hæres. 29. §. 9.

In Evangelio juxta Hebræos—quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni. Hieronym. adv. Pelag. l. 3. c. 1. Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους λεγομένῳ χρώμενοι, scil. Ebionæi. Euseb. l. 3. c. 27.

[p] In his late pamphlet called Nazarenus, c. 9.

[q] Epiphanius's account of the Gospel of the Nazarenes, see in Hæres. 29. §. 9. just now cited. Of the Gospel of the Ebionites, Hæres. 30. §. 3. he says, they call it the Gospel according to the Hebrews; and §. 13. he speaks thus of it; Ἐν τῷ γοῦν παρ' αὐτοῖς Εὐαγγελίῳ κατὰ Ματθαῖον ὀνομαζομένῳ, οὐχ ὅλῳ δὲ πληριστάτῳ, ἀλλὰ νενοθευμένῳ καὶ ἠκρωτηριασμένῳ, Ἑβραϊκὸν δὲ τοῦτο καλοῦσιν, &c. i. e. *in the Gospel which the Ebionites use, called the Gospel according to St. Matthew, not entire, but imperfect and corrupted.*

[r] In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus. Comment. in Matth. l. 2. c. 12.

[s] Porro ipsum Hebraicum habetur usque hodie in Cæsariensi bibliotheca, quam Pamphilus Martyr studiosissime confecit. Mihi quoque a Nazaræis, qui in Berœa, urbe Syriæ, hoc volumine utuntur, describendi facultas fuit. Catalog. Script. Eccles. ad Matth.

[t] Τῶν λοιπῶν Εὐαγγελίων σμικρὸν ἐποι-

tells us [u], "that those Jews, who had received the faith of "Christ, were extremely fond of this Gospel according to "the Hebrews." By these Jews it is impossible (as Valesius has observed) to understand any but the Nazarenes and Ebionites.

4. *This opinion, which the Nazarenes and Ebionites had of their Gospel, prevailed so far, as to be believed by a great many, if not by most.* Jerome expressly tells us, that, in his time, *it was believed by most to be the true and authentic Gospel of Matthew* [v]. And Eusebius tells us, that *it was acknowledged to be a genuine book by most in his time, and that it was rejected only by some.* His words are, "Among "these, viz. the spurious books, some place the Gospel accord-"ing to the Hebrews." His using the word τινες, and saying they were only *some* who looked upon this Gospel as spurious and apocryphal, is a plain intimation, that *a great many believed it to be genuine* [x]. It is not at all strange that the Nazarenes should endeavour to persuade the world, that their Gospel was the true one; and should gain credit with those, who were not able to contradict them.

5. *This current and commonly received opinion was most certainly false.* Here I must take it for granted, that our present Greek copies are authentic and true, I mean only so far as to contain all that St. Matthew wrote; and if so, it is certain the Gospels of the Nazarenes and Ebionites were spurious, for they contain a great many idle fables which are not in ours. These interpolations or additions are in part collected by Grotius [y], Father Simon [z], and others; but very fully, and set down at large, by the learned and laborious Fabricius, in his useful book, entitled, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, &c. [a] Any one who will be at the pains to consult the places

οὕντο λόγον. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 27.

[u] Τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον—ᾧ μάλιστα Ἑβραίων οἱ τὸν Χριστὸν παραδεξάμενοι χαίρουσι. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 25.

[v] In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthæi authenticum. Comm. in Matth. lib. 2. c. 12.

[x] Ἤδη δ' ἐν τουτοῖς (sc. νόθοις) τινες καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους Εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν. Loc. jam cit. Τινες, i. e. a paucis quibusdam. Vid. Millii Proleg. in N. T. §. 40.

[y] In Titul. Matth.

[z] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 7. p. 68, &c. Du Pin, vol. 2. c. 2. §. 3.

[a] From p. 356. to p. 371.

referred to, will soon perceive, that *the Gospel of St. Matthew according to the Hebrews, which the Nazarenes and Ebionites made use of, was very different from our present Gospel of St. Matthew.* The same may be undeniably proved from Jerome's translating it into Greek; had it been the same, or had there been only some little difference between this Hebrew Gospel and the true Greek copies, which were received into the canon of the church, it had been very absurd for Jerome to have translated it out of the Hebrew into Greek, as he says he did. Now from the foregoing observations it is very easy to perceive, how it came to pass that so many of the ancient fathers were imposed upon, and made to believe that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. There was a Gospel in the world which went under St. Matthew's name, wrote in Hebrew, and declared by those who used it, to be the original of St. Matthew; the credulous multitude believed as the Nazarenes did, and so the mistake was spread in the world. It is not possible but the Nazarenes would gain credit with some; nay it has been proved, that the generality did believe it; and therefore it can be no wonder that so many have asserted it.

CHAP. XVIII.

The fathers fell into the mistake that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, because none of them, except Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius understood that language. They were upon that account unable to compare the Gospel of the Nazarenes with their own Greek copies, and discover its spuriousness. This confirmed by a remark, that none of the fathers, who assert St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, have cited the Gospel of the Nazarenes, except the three mentioned, who understood that language. The reasons assigned, why they (Epiphanius, Jerome, and Origen) fell into the same mistake. Papias, the first Christian writer who asserts this, was a very fabulous and credulous person, yet was followed by many of the fathers in his mistakes (as Eusebius observes) by reason of his antiquity. His testimony in this matter proved by one part of it to be false.

IT will very much add to the probability of the foregoing ac-

count, that of all those fathers, who have fallen into this mistake, there were none that were able to prove it to be so, except Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome. They did not any of them understand the Hebrew language, and consequently, not being able to compare the Gospel of the Nazarenes with their own Greek copies, could not perceive its interpolations and additions, and so were under a sort of necessity of believing the common report. Had they been able to have read this Hebrew Gospel, and so to have perceived the difference between it and their own, they would certainly have rejected it, as not agreeable to St. Matthew's original, and consequently have lost the foundation of their opinion, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew.

To support this, I have made the following remark, viz. *That not one of all those fathers, who have asserted the Gospel of St. Matthew to be originally wrote in Hebrew, have made any use of the Gospel of the Nazarenes in their writings, except the three above mentioned, who understood Hebrew.* There is not the least evidence that either Papias, Irenæus, Eusebius, Austin, Chrysostom, Cyril, or Theophylact, ever saw or made use of this Gospel. It is not so much as once referred to in all their writings [b]. This could only be, because they did not understand the language in which it was written: had they understood Hebrew, no doubt some of them would have used it, as well as those three fathers who did. Indeed it has been thought by several learned men, that Papias made use of this Gospel, and cited the story of the adulterous woman out of it. So father Simon; "Papias saith, that the history of "the woman, who was accused of many sins before our Sa- "viour, is to be read in the Gospel that was called *according* "*to the Hebrews*." But this is a very great mistake, which this and other learned men are fallen into for want of carefully observing Eusebius's words: he does not say that *Papias took this out of the Gospel according to the Hebrews;* but that this story *was among Papias's works*, and then adds in his own words, *that this history is in that Gospel* [c]. From whence it

[b] The ground of my asserting this, is Fabricius's collection of the fragments of it, among which there is not one cited out of any of those fathers.

[c] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 29.

does not follow, that he, any more than Papias, had read this Gospel. If then none of those, who assert St. Matthew to have wrote in Hebrew, did understand Hebrew, and if none of them did see the Gospel of the Nazarenes; no wonder they fell in with the common report of the Nazarenes, that their Gospel was the true original one of St. Matthew. Thus I have shewn, how very likely it was the fathers should fall into this mistake.

This is so far from being a precarious supposition, that it may be made very evident by that which Epiphanius tells us; viz. "That the Nazarenes in his time had the Gospel of Mat-"thew very complete in Hebrew; for without doubt it is pre-"served by them till this day, as it was at first written in He-"brew letters; but I cannot tell whether they have taken "away the genealogies from Abraham to Christ, or not[d]." Now from these words it is evident,

1. That he never saw the Gospel of the Nazarenes; and so,

2. He thought it to be the very same with that which St. Matthew wrote; wherefore,

3. He could not but believe St. Matthew wrote his Gospel at first in Hebrew.

This was the case with Epiphanius; and if it was so with one that was a native of Palestine, that understood the Hebrew language; if, I say, he was thus imposed upon by the Nazarenes, how much more easily would those be imposed upon who lived in distant countries, and knew nothing at all of the language.

It seems indeed a little strange, that Origen and Jerome, who both understood the language, and saw the Gospel of the Nazarenes, should fall into this error. They compared frequently the Gospel of the Nazarenes and the Greek copies together, and cite them very often in their works; nay, and Jerome translated this Gospel into Greek and Latin: they could not therefore be deceived, and think it the original of

[d] Ἔχουσι δὲ τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον πληρέστατον Ἑβραϊστί· παρ' αὐτοῖς γὰρ σαφῶς τοῦτο, καθὼς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγράφη Ἑβραϊκοῖς γράμμασιν, ἔτι σώζεται. Οὐκ οἶδα δὲ, εἰ καὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἄχρι Χριστοῦ περιεῖλον. Hæres. 29. §. 9.

St. Matthew, and therefore conclude that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew.

This indeed seems to be a very considerable objection, which has not, I think, been at all taken notice of yet. In answer to it, I observe,

1. As to Origen, that he does not deliver it as his opinion, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, *but only as what he received by tradition;* unless he mention it somewhere else in his writings, besides that place cited by Eusebius [e]. But,

2. Suppose both Jerome and he had asserted this, it might perhaps proceed *from a too great respect to so universal a tradition.* They found it was asserted by every body, and therefore they believed it: it is well known, how very little suspicious the first Christians were of the traditions of the church. But,

3. This will appear more probable, if we consider, *who among the Gentile Christians was the first author of this opinion.* As far as we can trace it, it owes its original to Papias, bishop of Hierapolis [f]; who, though a person of a very weak genius, both credulous and fabulous, was very likely to be believed, even by Jerome and Origen. He was contemporary with the apostles, and passed under the specious character of being *a hearer of St. John, an intimate of Polycarp, and a man of the greatest antiquity* [g]; and this possibly might, in some measure, influence these two learned men to give into the received opinion, without making themselves a strict inquiry thereinto.

4. This conjecture is very much confirmed by a remark which Eusebius has made concerning this Papias [h], viz. "That he has related a great many fabulous stories of our "Saviour, particularly that he should reign corporally on "earth for a thousand years after the resurrection. These

[e] Ὡς ἐν παραδόσει μαθὼν περὶ τῶν τεσσάρων Εὐαγγελίων. Histor. Eccl. l. 6. c. 25.

[f] L. 6. c. 39.

[g] Ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἑταῖρος γεγονὼς, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ. Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 5. c. 33. Concerning Papias's age, and this testimony of Irenæus, see the learned Mr. Dodwell's Dissert. in Iren. 1. §. 3, &c.

[h] Σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων τεκμηράμενον εἰκεῖν, φαίνεται· πλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείστοις ὅσοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, τῆς ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε, τὴν ἀρχαιότητα τ' ἀνδρὸς προβεβλημένοις. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.

" things," says Eusebius, " he imagined, mistaking the apo-
" stles' meaning—for he was a person of a very mean genius,
" as appears from his works; yet almost all ecclesiastical
" writers were led by him into this mistake, influenced by the
" antiquity of the man; or, as Valesius renders it, *hominis*
" *vetustate sententiam suam tuentibus*, i. e. defending their
" opinion by the argument of its author's antiquity." This now makes it more probable, that Origen and Jerome, who were able to confute it, should yet receive this common tradition.

Having here had occasion to mention Papias, as the first who published this opinion of St. Matthew's being written originally in Hebrew, I cannot but take notice of *one thing in his testimony, which seems to invalidate it, or at least to make it very dubious and uncertain.* What I mean is this; he says [i], that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and that *every one interpreted it as they were able*, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἠδύνατο ἕκαστος. Now hence it follows, that in his time there was no authentic Greek version made, if there was any at all. This Father Simon (though it be to serve a bad purpose) does justly infer [k]; " If," says he, " there had been in his time (viz. Papias's) " a Greek version of the Gospel of St. Matthew, " which had been made by some apostle, he would not have " failed to have told us of it." But notwithstanding this assertion of Papias, there seems to be very good reason to believe the contrary; for all the writers of that age, contemporaries with Papias, and some of them older than he, when they cite this Gospel, do cite it as it is in our present Greek copies. Clemens Romanus, Ignatius, Barnabas, Polycarp, (an acquaintance of Papias's [l],) Irenæus, (an acquaintance of Polycarp's [m],) and Justin Martyr, do cite this Gospel in such a manner, as undeniably evidences, not only that they made use of the same copies, but also the same with our present Greek ones. This I assert upon a strict examination of this matter in each of these authors. Now this could not possibly have been, if, according to Papias, every one translated as they were able, and

[i] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 39.
[k] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 9. p. 79.
[l] Iren. adv. Hæres. l. 5. c. 33.
[m] Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 20.

there was no common version. Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose, that they should all happen to make use of the same Greek words. Besides, none of these fathers, except Barnabas, did understand, or were able to translate at all out of the Hebrew. There must therefore (supposing St. Matthew to have wrote in Hebrew) have been some common version at this time into Greek, and consequently Papias must be mistaken in this part of his testimony; and if so, it seems very reasonable to conclude he was mistaken in the other part also. And thus I think we have set aside the first and most ancient testimony, that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, and that which, together with the tradition of the Nazarenes, seems to have led so many of the fathers into this mistake.

Upon the whole, this is what I judge to be clear from what has been said: the Nazarenes made very early a translation of St. Matthew's Gospel into Hebrew, for the use of the Jews, with several additions: this they still called, The Gospel of St. Matthew, and declared to be his original; Papias, a silly and credulous writer, believed them; and so, in succeeding ages, the Nazarenes still declaring the same, the opinion passed from one to another without any contradiction [n].

CHAP. XIX.

Several arguments, by which it appears probable, that St. Matthew did not write his Gospel in Hebrew. The Greek was the most common language, and for that reason that Gospel was most likely to be useful therein. The supposing it a translation makes its inspiration dubious. It is not probable, that the original Hebrew would ever have been lost. The Hebrew one we have now is certainly a translation out of Greek.

THOUGH there is not, that I know of, any one consider-

[n] Les Nazaréens écrivèrent leur Evangile sur les instructions ou mémoires de S. Matthieu, et ils en parlèrent comme de l'Evangile de S. Matthieu. Papias les crut de bonne foi, et cette opinion passe ainsi de main en main. Mr. L'Enfant, chaplain to the king of Prussia, in his Remarks upon Dr. Mill's Testament, in a letter to Mr. Le Clerc, Biblioth. Choisie, tom. 16. art. 5. p. 292.

able argument to prove that St. Matthew wrote in Hebrew, besides the testimony of the fathers; yet very great numbers of learned men have thought that of itself sufficient. The Papists almost all, and a great many among the Protestants, (viz. Casaubon, Grotius, Dr. Cave, Vossius, &c.) have submitted to the authority of the fathers in this matter. On the other hand, the warmest advocates for the reformation (viz. Calvin, Chemnitius, Chamier, Whitaker, Mich. Waltherus, &c.) contend, that our present Greek copies are the original in which St. Matthew wrote.

Having in the foregoing chapter endeavoured to shew how it came to pass, that the fathers so universally fell into the mistake of St. Matthew's being wrote in Hebrew, I would now offer two or three other arguments, whereby it will appear this Gospel was originally written in Greek, and not in Hebrew.

1. *The Greek was the most proper language for St. Matthew to write in, in order to answer the ends and designs of his writing.* Here I must take it for granted, that St. Matthew's design in writing was the same as that of the other writers of the New Testament, viz. the propagating the history and doctrines of Christ to as great a part of the world as possible. For though St. Matthew (as well as St. Mark, and perhaps all the sacred writers of the New Testament) was more immediately influenced by some particular occasion to write; yet there can be no doubt but that he would write his Gospel so that it might be of the most extensive usefulness. It is hard to suppose him under the conduct of divine inspiration, and not suppose him to write so, as his Gospel should be most useful and beneficial to the world; and if so, then it was necessary he should write in Greek. The Hebrew language was then but very little known and used in comparison of what the Greek was. Nay the Latin, the language of the empire, was not at that time, when St. Matthew wrote, near so much in use as the Greek: "The Greek language is read in all "nations, but the Latin is confined within very narrow limits," says Cicero [o]. Hence it is observable, that St. Paul, though

[o] Græca leguntur in omnibus fere gentibus, Latina suis finibus, exiguis sane, continentur. Orat. pro Arch. Poet. §. 23.

he wrote to the Jews or Hebrews, yet, for the more extensive usefulness of that inspired Epistle, wrote in Greek. And so also did St. Peter and St. James, although their Epistles were immediately designed for and directed to the Jews.

2. Our present Greek copy of St. Matthew is not a translation out of Hebrew, *because the supposing it to be so makes its authority very precarious and uncertain.* This argument is founded upon the supposition of this (as well as other historical books) being wrote by the influences and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Now the supposing it a translation, is inconsistent with that authority and esteem which every inspired book does necessarily demand. This is evident, because we have not the least evidence of the inspiration of the translator, nor the least reason to conclude the translation is just. The fathers, who were imposed upon to believe it originally wrote in Hebrew, found themselves under a necessity of imputing the translation to some inspired person, though they can by no means agree who the person was. The author of the Synopsis which goes under Athanasius's name, says, "It was translated "by James, the brother of our Lord, according to the flesh [p]." Theophylact attributes it to St. John the evangelist, according to the tradition that was current in his time [q]. Anastasius Sinaita says, it was done by St. Luke and St. Paul jointly [r]. Nicephorus ascribes it to Barnabas [s]. Such was the diversity of opinions among the ancients in this matter; but in this they all agree, that it was necessary it should be done by an inspired person. So also the more modern writers, especially the protestants, who believe it a translation, (though few, I think, except Dr. Mill [t] pretend to fix the person,) all find it necessary to conclude it done by an inspired person. So Casaubon [u] and many others; but the truth is, they have no just foundation for saying so: Jerome honestly confesses, "it was very uncer-

[p] Ἑρμηνεύθη δὲ ὑπὸ Ἰακώβου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου τὸ κατὰ σάρκα. Vid. Casaub. ad Baron. Annal. c. 16. §. 115.

[q] Præfat. in Matth.

[r] Apud Casaub. ibid.

[s] Hist. Eccl. l. 16. c. 37.

[t] Prolegom. in Nov. Test. §. 66.

[u] Quæ diversitas sententiarum, ut de vero auctore certo pronuntiare nos vetat, ita illud certissime demonstrat, ipsis apostolorum temporibus, ab uno illorum, aut illorum auspiciis, vel potius Spiritus Sancti, cujus ipsi erant organa, Græcum textum ex Hebraico esse confectum. Exercit. ad Baron. Annal. c. 15. §. 12.

" tain who translated it out of Hebrew into Greek [x]:" and if so, it is impossible it should have equal authority with the other books. For all we know to the contrary, it may be a very false and corrupt translation; it may be done by a person no way qualified for such a work; and does not this now make its authority dubious and uncertain? For my part I freely own, if I believed it to be a translation made by a person I know nothing of, I could not yield it that same respect, and have that same value for it, as the other parts of the sacred writings. The papists, who are always endeavouring to lessen the authority of the scriptures, that so they might make them depend upon their church for their authority, were very well aware of this; and hence there is not, I think, above one or two of them (viz. Cajetan and Erasmus, if he be to be called a papist) but have fallen in with the common error of the fathers. Baronius, Father Simon, Du Pin, and the rest of the popish writers, have been of this opinion, and being so, have not failed to draw the consequence I am now speaking of from it, viz. *that our present Greek copies are of very dubious authority*. " I affirm it," says Baronius [y], " that the authority of " the Greek text is very uncertain, unless we had the original " Hebrew to compare with it." The learned Casaubon, in his answer to Baronius, (though he believed St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew,) was very unwilling to allow the cardinal's consequence; " If," says he, " the Greek text of this Gospel " depends upon the Hebrew, then this Gospel, as we have it " now, is of no authority;" and adds a little after, " then the " faith of the true catholic church must depend upon the faith " or credit of heretics," (he means the Roman church,) " which " God forbid [z]." To this Father Simon answers, heartily espousing the cause of Baronius, and says in so many words, " There is nothing, but the authority of the church alone, that " gives authority to this version, and that can oblige us to

[x] Quod quis postea in Græcum transtulerit, non satis certum est. Catal. Eccles. Script. in voc. Matth.

[y] Dico, quod Græcus textus cujus fidei sit, nisi collato cum Hebræo originali, affirmare non possumus. Apud Casaub. Exercit. c. 16. §. 115.

[z] Si auctoritas Græci textus pendet ab Hebraico textu; quum Hebræa dudum perierint, neque usquam extent hodie; sequitur necessario, nullum hodie ejus Evangelii debere esse pondus, nullam auctoritatem—Adde quod hæc sententia fidem catholicæ ecclesiæ facit pendere (nefas dictu) ab hæreticorum fide. Casaub. ibid.

" prefer it before the Hebrew or Chaldaic copy of the Naza-
" renes[a]." However Casaubon and other Protestants may seem to shuffle off, and elude these consequences, they seem to be inevitable. Hence it was justly remarked by Mr. L'Enfant in his letter to Le Clerc[b], " It appears to me very probable
" that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in Greek, as the other
" apostles did, and with the same design. For I can think of
" nothing that sounds more like a Papist, than to talk of the
" work of an apostle translated into Greek by I do not know
" who, nor I do not know how." As we would therefore avoid this consequence of making the authority of this Gospel uncertain, we must conclude it not to be a translation. I would only add further on this head, that not only the Papists, but the Jews, and other enemies of Christianity, will be very likely to improve this assertion to the dishonour of this Gospel, so far as to make them reject as uncertain one of the most valuable parts of sacred history. This is not only what might be reasonably expected, but what has been really matter of fact[c]. So the learned Jew, with whom Limborch disputes, argues against this Gospel; " They say," says he, " that Matthew
" wrote in Hebrew, but the original is lost; afterwards his
" Gospel appeared in Greek, but nobody knows who trans-
" lated it[d]."

3. St. Matthew's Gospel was not wrote originally in Hebrew, but in Greek; because, if so, the original Gospel is entirely lost, which cannot be supposed. If it was wrote in Hebrew, it is very certain that which we now have in that language under St. Matthew's name is not it. For this was first published by Munster, and he owns he received it from the Jews *tattered, torn, and very imperfect*, and *that he himself added what he thought necessary:* so that it is very strange, that Quinquarboreus, in his preface to this Hebrew Gospel[e], should imagine

[a] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 9.

[b] Il me paroît fort vraisemblable, que St. Matthieu écrivit son Evangile en Grec, comme les autres, et dans le même dessein. Car je ne trouve rien, qui ait plus l'air d'un Romain, qu'une version Grecque d'un ouvrage d'un apôtre, faite par je ne sais qui, ni comment. Biblioth. Choisie, tom. 16. art. 5. p. 292.

[c] Vid. Sixt. Senens. l. 7. de Evang. Matth. Hæres.

[d] Matthæus fertur Hebraico idiomate scripsisse; sed quod, eo autographo deperdito, Græco sermone postea translatum apparuit, ab incerto autore ea lingua donatum. Limborch. de Verit. Christ. Relig. quæst. 4. num. 8.

[e] Quod autem hoc ipsum sit Evangelium, quod D. Matthæus Hebraice

it to be the very same Gospel which St. Matthew wrote, although he had observed what Munster said. I need not be at the pains to confute this opinion: it is evidently a version of our present Greek; it has here and there a few words added, and sometimes a few omitted; yet it is (as far as I have observed) a pretty good version, though I dare affirm it is but a late one. If St. Matthew therefore wrote in Hebrew, the original is lost; but this cannot be supposed, without also supposing the first Christians and primitive churches guilty of unpardonable negligence. Is it likely a treasure of so much value would be no more regarded? If it was wrote in Hebrew, it was wrote for the Jews, and the Jews were not wont to be so careless of their sacred books. The bishop and church at Jerusalem would, no doubt, have safely preserved a book so valuable. "Surely," says Chamier[f], "the negligence of the "universal church, or even the church at Jerusalem, would "not be so great as to let the original of St. Matthew be lost, "that there is not the least of it to be found; nay that it "should not only now be not extant, but even utterly un-"known in the second century." There were, no doubt, copies of this Gospel taken as soon as it was published, and spread among the Jews every where; and is it likely that all these copies should be so entirely lost? This is hard to be conceived, and therefore it is very improbable that St. Matthew wrote first in Hebrew.

CHAP. XX.

Though St. Matthew's Gospel be supposed a translation out of Hebrew, yet it was not for that reason more liable to dislocation or disorder.

AS it is probable that our present Greek copies of St. Matthew are not a translation out of Hebrew; so,

2. It is certain that if they were, they would not have been

scripsit, ambigere quis possit. Edit. Paris. A. D. 1551.

[f] Non fuisse tantam sive ecclesiæ universalis, sive etiam Hierosolymitanæ, negligentiam, ut ejus editionis nullum sit omnino vestigium conservatum, &c. Panstrat. Cathol. l. 11. c. 8. §. 8.

at all upon that account more liable to the confusion and disorder Mr. Whiston supposes. I confess I am not able to guess how the translation (supposing it to be so) could any way influence or occasion these dislocations. It were to be wished that Mr. Whiston had told us, how the translating it could have had this bad influence, or that he had produced one single instance of any one book in the world, that has thus suffered by its being translated. Of the vast number of versions that have been made of the Old, and the other parts of the New Testament into all languages, not one has produced this bad effect; neither the Seventy, nor Jonathan, nor Onkelos, nor any other of the Greek or Chaldee translators, disordered the Old Testament by their versions; neither the Syriac nor Arabic, nor any of the many Latin translators of the New Testament, did occasion any such dislocations in it; and is it then to be credited, that the translator of St. Matthew should be the occasion of so many dislocations in this part of his Gospel? When not one of all the versions in the world has occasioned so much as one single disorder, is it likely the translator of St. Matthew should occasion about twenty, in ten short chapters?

But to shew the absurdity of this supposition, I would argue in the following manner:

If the translation of this Gospel be supposed to influence and cause the transposition and disorder of these several parts, then it is plain these parts were not transposed or misplaced before the translator began his work, and consequently the disorder must happen either *in the time of translating*, or *afterwards*. It was not likely to be done *in the time of translating;* for why should a person's reading a book with a design to translate it into another language, any more occasion a disorder in it, than if he had read it with no such design? If it was in its right order *then*, (according to the supposition,) it is much more reasonable to suppose the translator would endeavour to keep it so, than by any means misplace it. Thus it was not done in the time of translating; and it is very evident the translation could not influence the disorder *after it was made*, but would rather be a good means to prevent any such disorder happening to the original, if there had been any danger of it.

The other remark which Mr. Whiston makes is, that "this "disorder concludes, and the true order begins to be observed, "at a very remarkable period, viz. the death of St. John the "Baptist, and the commencing of our Saviour's single ministry "thereupon g." To this I think it sufficient to answer, that there are several other periods of the Gospel history, as remarkable as this, where no disorder has happened.

CHAP. XXI.

Several arguments to prove that our present Greek copies of St. Matthew are not at all transposed or disordered since that evangelist's first writing. No book ever was thus disordered. It does not seem agreeable to the care which divine Providence always exercised towards the sacred books, to permit this to have happened to St. Matthew's Gospel. No other part of St. Matthew's Gospel disordered, and therefore not this. The dislocations, which Mr. Whiston supposes, could not happen to this Gospel in the apostles' time.

HITHERTO I have been considering what Mr. Whiston offers in defence of his proposition, and by many ways shewing how unreasonable it is to assert this Gospel so transposed and misplaced, as he does. All that I shall do further, shall be only to add three or four other arguments, by which it will appear, that *our present copies of St. Matthew have not suffered any dislocations, but are in this respect the very same as when St. Matthew at first wrote.* In order to which I observe,

1. That there never has yet been discovered or proved an instance of any such transpositions and misplacings in any writings sacred or profane, in any language, by any means whatsoever. It is indeed very difficult to assert and defend an universal negative proposition, and to say such a thing *never has been*, unless the being of it be impossible, and imply a contradiction to some certain and well-established truth. Though indeed such a disorder, as Mr. Whiston supposes, be not a thing in itself absolutely impossible to have happened either to this or some other book; yet I will venture to assert, it is such

g Page 111.

a disorder as never has happened to any one whatsoever. If ever such a thing did happen, it was most likely to have been before the art of writing was brought to that perfection, and had received those improvements, which it had in St. Matthew's time: instead of this, not one of the books of the Old Testament, nor Homer, Hesiod, Demosthenes, Isocrates, &c. who wrote long before St. Matthew's time; nor any of the books of the New Testament; nor Cicero, Ovid, Horace, nor any of the Roman poets or historians, who wrote about his time, have suffered any such misfortune, as Mr. Whiston supposes this Gospel to have done. It is true indeed, Spinoza, and after him Father Simon, and Mr. Whiston, *have imagined some such dislocations to have happened to some parts of the Old Testament* (as has been said in the preface). But after the closest examination of what they have said, I can find little more than bare assertions; and therefore till some further proof than yet has been be made, I must conclude their opinion false.

2. It does not seem consistent with that care which divine Providence always did exercise, and may be reasonably supposed always would exercise, towards the books of inspiration, to suppose this Gospel so confused and disordered as Mr. Whiston does. Every one, who is at all acquainted with the history of the Jewish nation, must needs acknowledge, that a remarkably kind Providence has always concerned itself in the preservation of the books of the Old Testament. In the most degenerate state of that unhappy nation, in the times of their ignorance and idolatry, their slavery and captivity, the books which were given them by God, and received into the canon of their church, were preserved safe and uncorrupted, notwithstanding the malicious efforts of their enemies to the contrary. It does not appear that any one of all these books has been lost [h], though their conquering enemies endeavoured to the utmost to destroy them. A remarkable instance of this Josephus tells us [i], viz. that "Antiochus Epiphanes, when he had sub- "dued Jerusalem, tried all possible methods to abolish the re- "ligion of the Jews; and, in order to that, made particular

[h] Vide Turretin. de Scrip. quæst. 7. et Spanhem. Dub. Evang. par. 2. dub. 88.

[i] Ἠφανίζετο δὲ, εἴ που βίβλος εὑρεθείη ἱερὰ, καὶ νόμος, καὶ παρ' οἷς εὑρεθείοι, καὶ οὗτοι κακοὶ κακῶς ἀπώλοντο. Antiq. Jud. l. 12. c. 5. §. 4. The same account we have 1 Macc. i. 56, 57.

" search after the sacred volume, destroying it wherever it was " found, and punishing with death all those in whose possession " it was." But he, who was the author of them, took care of them, and preserved them not only from being lost, but from being in any remarkable degree corrupted. It is true indeed, there are some slight corruptions crept into the text, both of the Old and New Testament, through the carelessness of transcribers; there are a great number of various lections in both; but these are such as without a constant miracle could not but happen, and are to be found in as great, or greater number, in several of the profane authors, (as the learned Dr. Bentley has very well observed [k],) and are for the most part such, that it is not much matter which reading we choose. But the corruptions which Mr. Whiston supposes in St. Matthew are of another nature: these are such as render the text of the Gospel very precarious, and make it depend upon the judgment and fancy of every one who pleases to alter it. And is this now consistent with the care of divine Providence? Is it likely God would permit this useful Gospel to be thus confusedly put together by such a blunderer, who out of twenty parts could not put but *one* in its proper order? This sure can never be believed by any, who acknowledge a divine Providence to have concerned itself at all about the sacred volume.

3. It is very improbable this part of St. Matthew's Gospel should be so disordered and confused; because all the other part of it is exactly in the order in which the evangelist wrote, without the least transposition. Mr. Whiston's hypothesis, by which he accounts for the dislocation of the several periods of the former part of this Gospel, is, that they were wrote upon *separate and distinct* pieces of paper: now upon this hypothesis I argue thus;

Either St. Matthew wrote the other parts of his Gospel on small pieces of paper, or he did not. If it be said, he did not, then it is yet more unaccountable, that he should write this former part so: it is incredible that these fourteen chapters should be written on twenty several pieces of paper, and the other fourteen on one large roll. If on the other hand it be said, that St. Matthew wrote the latter part of his Gospel, as he did

[k] Answer to the Discourse of Free-Thinking, part 1. p. 64, &c.

the former, on many pieces of paper; then it is no less incredible, that none of these pieces should have the same misfortune to be disordered and misplaced as the former. How can it be supposed possible, that every one of the papers in the latter part should be in its right and due order, and not so much as one of the former but is misplaced, except the first? I conclude therefore, that the former part of this Gospel is not misplaced.

4. The improbability of this part of St. Matthew's Gospel being misplaced, will appear, if we consider that there has been no time ever since St. Matthew wrote, in which there were not some circumstances which would prevent such a disorder. To evidence this, I argue thus; if this part of St. Matthew's Gospel be misplaced, either the disorder happened in the apostles' time, or not till after their decease. But as it is improbable that it happened in their time, so it is morally impossible that it should have happened afterwards.

I. It is not probable that this disorder could happen in the time of the apostles; for if it had, they would, no doubt, have rectified it. Many reasons would oblige them not to suffer so great a dislocation to remain in the Gospel history. They would never recommend a book to the perusal of their converts, which they knew justly chargeable with such notorious corruptions. It is much more reasonable to suppose, that, if this Gospel was then misplaced and out of order, they would restore it to its proper order, and take care that some copies should be made, in which the histories should be placed in the same order in which the evangelist wrote. Now if they did this, it is strange none of these copies should have others made from them, but all the books in the world should proceed from one disordered copy, made in the apostles' time.

It mayp erhaps be said, that this disorder might happen in the apostles' time, and they be ignorant of it. This indeed is possible, but very improbable. The office and business of an apostle was to preach the doctrine, and publish the miracles, of Jesus Christ. Now St. Matthew having, by the influences of the Holy Spirit, collected a very early, full, and authentic account, both of the doctrines and miracles of Christ, there can be no doubt but the apostles would make use of it them-

selves, and recommend it to the use of others. Not to have done this, would have been to cast that contempt upon the work of one inspired apostle, which we cannot suppose another would do; besides, not to have made use of this, would have been to neglect one likely means of obtaining the ends of their apostleship. Hence Eusebius[l] tells us, that when the pious Pantænus (who lived in the time of Irenæus and Origen) "went "to preach the Gospel to the Indians, where St. Bartholomew "had been preaching the Gospel before him, he found there "the Gospel of St. Matthew." No doubt the apostles, when they went abroad to preach the Gospel, did take both this and the other Gospels along with them, and left copies of them, when they were gone, for the use of their converts, as I shall shew more fully hereafter. Hence it seems very reasonable to conclude the apostles made use of this Gospel; which if they did, they being eyewitnesses to the history, could not but perceive such dislocations and misplacings, as those which we are treating of, and so, no doubt, would have corrected them. This argument is abundantly confirmed by a testimony of Eusebius[m], viz. "that the three former Gospels were perused by "St. John, and that he approved them." Now if St. Matthew's Gospel had been so confusedly set together as Mr. Whiston supposes, St. John would certainly never have approved of it. Mr. Whiston cannot question this testimony of Eusebius, having himself used it on another occasion[n]. I conclude therefore, that this disorder did not happen to this Gospel in the apostles' time.

[l] Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 10. Vid. Vales. ad loc.

[m] Τῶν προαναγεγραφότων τριῶν εἰς πάντας ἤδη καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν (sc. Ἰωάννην) διαδιδομένων, ἀποδέξασθαι μὲν φασὶν, &c. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24. The same is related by Theophylact. Præfat. in Matth.

[n] Page 132.

CHAP. XXII.

The disorder Mr. Whiston supposes in the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel could not possibly happen after the apostles' time, because of the great number of copies that were spread abroad in the world in their time. The time when St. Matthew wrote, and the distance between that time and St. John's death, considered. That the Gospels were very much dispersed in the apostles' time, largely proved. Mr. Hobbes, Mr. Toland, and Mr. Dodwell's notion of the Gospels being a long while unknown and concealed, confuted by several arguments.

II. AS this disorder did not happen in the time of the apostles, so it neither did nor possibly could happen afterwards. Mr. Whiston does not any where hint to us, at what time he supposes these dislocations made; nor does Mr. Toinard say any more in this respect, than that they were done, *antiquissima schedarum transpositione*, "by a very ancient confusion "of the papers," on which they were wrote. It was not without reason that they thus left the time undetermined, being well aware of the difficulties that would attend their hypothesis, if they had determined it. As such dislocations could not happen in the apostles' time, so it was morally impossible they should have happened afterwards: to mention no other arguments, this will sufficiently appear by the two following considerations.

1. That there were a very great number of these Gospels spread up and down in the world before the apostles' death.

2. The Syriac version, which seems to have been made in the apostles' time, has the several branches or periods of this history in the same order with our present Greek copies.

1. The disorder or dislocation, which Mr. Whiston supposes in St. Matthew's Gospel, could not possibly happen after the apostles' death; because between the first writing of it and that time, there were a very great number of true copies spread in different parts of the world, which would certainly prevent it. It is not very easy, indeed, precisely to determine the time in which either this or any of the Gospels was wrote. The most ancient account which I have met with about the

time of St. Matthew's writing is in Irenæus, viz. "that he wrote "it when St. Peter and St. Paul were preaching the Gospel at "Rome[o]." When St. Peter was at Rome is not very certain; Irenæus tells us here, it was the same time that St. Paul was there, viz. in the third year of Nero, (according to Eusebius in his Chronicon,) and the fifty-ninth of Christ; and to this most chronologers[p] agree. Now according to this account, this Gospel was not written till about twenty-six years after our Lord's ascension. But this seems very improbable, because the Christian converts cannot be supposed to have been so long a time destitute of any written account of our Saviour's miracles and doctrines. It is much more likely that this Gospel was wrote at the time when Eusebius has placed it in his Chronicon, viz. in the third year of Caligula, and the forty-first of Christ. To this agrees the account of Theophylact[q], that St. Matthew "wrote his Gospel about eight years after our "Lord's ascension." The same is affirmed at the end of several ancient manuscripts. So, for instance, in that of Beza (which he gave to the university of Cambridge, and is reputed the most ancient manuscript of the Gospels in the world) there is written[r], "The Gospel of St. Matthew was published eight "years after our Lord's ascension." The same is written at the end of an ancient manuscript[s] in Mr. Colbert's library. To the same purpose, at the end of the old Arabic version of this Gospel it is written[t], "St. Matthew wrote eight years after "our Lord ascended, in the first year of Claudius[u]." Now if we take this last account, and reckon from St. Matthew's writing eight years after our Lord's ascension (in the last years of Caligula, or the first of Claudius) to the death of St. John, we shall find the intervening space to be about sixty years; for St. John lived till the reign of Trajan, as Irenæus[x], who lived

[o] Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος—γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν Εὐαγγελίου, τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελιζομένων. Adver. Hæres. l. 3. c. 1.

[p] Helvicus, Petavius, Spanheim, Tallents, Dr. Lightfoot, &c. Vid. et Lactant. l. 4. c. 21.

[q] Præfat. in Matth.

[r] See Bez. ad Matt. xxviii. ult.

[s] See Father Simon, Crit. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 11.

[t] Vid. Lud. de Dieu, ad Matt. xxviii. ult.

[u] This does not differ above half a year from the above mentioned account out of Eusebius, of its being written in the third year of Caligula; for he reigned but three years and some months, and Claudius succeeded him.

[x] Adv. Hæres. l. 2. c. 39. in fin.

not long after him, and Clemens Alexandrinus[y], inform us. Now Trajan, according to Eusebius[z], began his reign in the year of Christ 101; so that from St. Matthew's writing in the year of Christ 41 to the death of St. John in Trajan's reign must be at least sixty years; and in this long interval there were undoubtedly great numbers of copies of this Gospel dispersed in all those distant countries where the Gospel was preached. Very probably many thousand copies were made, and sent into all those places where Christianity prevailed. Eusebius[a], speaking concerning the evangelists in the apostolic times, says, "they travelled up and down in the world, "preaching the Gospel, and very industriously endeavoured, "τὴν τῶν θείων Εὐαγγελίων παραδιδόναι γραφήν· i. e. to disperse "abroad copies of the holy Gospels." And in another place[b] he assures us, that, "before St. John wrote his Gospel, the "other Gospels were in the hands of all men." If this be true, is it a thing credible, that of all the copies that have been known in the world, not one should be derived from any of those vast numbers of copies that were made and spread abroad in the world in the apostles' time? Can it be imagined that all the manuscripts in the world are derived from one confused misplaced copy, that was made after the apostles' time; and not so much as one from any of those innumerable copies that were in their right order till the apostles' death? This, I think, cannot without manifest absurdity be supposed.

It will not be at all foreign to my present purpose, to consider a little more particularly, what a great number of copies of the Gospels, and particularly of St. Matthew's, were spread abroad in the world in the apostles' time, at least before the death of St. John. I am the more inclined to consider this matter, because I find a very learned writer has taken some pains to persuade the world, *that the Gospels, and other writings of the New Testament, lay for a long time concealed and unobserved in the world.* The person I mean is Mr. Dodwell, who in his elaborate dissertations upon Irenæus[c] tells us,

[y] Apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 23.

[z] In Chronic.

[a] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 37.

[b] Τῶν προαναγραφέντων τριῶν εἰς πάντας ἤδη—διαδεδομένων. l. 3. c. 24.

[c] Latitabant enim usque ad recentiora illa, seu Trajani, seu etiam fortasse Hadriani tempora, in privatarum ecclesiarum, seu etiam hominum scri-

" that the canonical writings of the New Testament lay con-
" cealed and unknown in the coffers of some private churches,
" or perhaps some private persons, till the later times of Tra-
" jan, or perhaps of Adrian;" (i. e. till the year of Christ 120, or perhaps 130;) " so that they were not at all known by the " catholic church." He proceeds for a page or two in saying things much to the same purpose. Mr. Toland, observing how much this passage would serve his purpose, *to render the canon of scripture uncertain*, transcribes it at large in his Amyntor, and declares his assent to the truth of it[d]. Mr. Hobbes, in his Leviathan, is very much of the same opinion; he says[e], " the copies of the books of the New Testament were not " many—that the council of Laodicea is the first we know of " that recommended the Bible to the then Christian churches " —that the copies of the books of the New Testament were " then only in the hands of the ecclesiastics," &c. I do not design particularly to discuss this whimsical and groundless opinion. Mr. Nye, in his answer to Amyntor[f], Mr. Le Clerc, in his Reflections on these two sections of Mr. Dodwell[g], and archbishop Tenison, in his Answer to Leviathan[h], have sufficiently done this already. I shall only endeavour by two or three arguments to evidence, that the Gospels were so much dispersed abroad in the world, that no such confusion could happen to St. Matthew as Mr. Whiston supposes. This will appear,

1. If we consider the design and end for which these sacred books were written. They were not written for the use of any one private particular person, but for the benefit and instruction of all mankind. They were books of a more large and extensive importance than any which had ever yet been published in the world; they were such in which the present and future happiness of all men was nearly concerned. And is it likely such books should lie concealed in private chests or coffers, some for forty, others for fifty, sixty, seventy, or more years? The zeal of the apostles and first Christians, for propagating

niis scripta illa canonica, ne ad ecclesiæ catholicæ notitiam pervenirent. Dissert. 1. §. 38.

[d] Page 78.

[e] Leviath. par. 3. c. 33.

[f] Page 41.

[g] In his third Dissertation annexed to his Harmony of the Gospels.

[h] Hobbes's Creed, art. 9.

Christianity, was not such as it is represented, if they would be so negligent as this. If this be supposed, it follows, that they slighted one of the most likely means to make men converts to their new religion. Whatever others did, one would imagine the penmen of these sacred books should themselves have taken care to distribute and disperse them. If they did not thus, it will follow, that they had not very just regards to that Holy Spirit who influenced them to write. Besides, Christianity in its very infancy made a very great noise in the world: the doctrines of it were new and surprising; vast numbers continually embraced it: one would think therefore, that, had there been nothing else, men's curiosity would have influenced them to procure those authentic accounts which the Gospels contain; that so they might know the history of a person's life and doctrines who had been so remarkable, and made so great a figure in the world. I remember Josephus [i] tells us, that when he had finished his History of the War of the Jews, "he immediately "sold great numbers of his books to the Romans, Jews, and "others, who understood the Greek language." And can it be supposed that this, the most useful and remarkable history that ever was in the world, should lie in private coffers, quite concealed and unknown, for so long a time as has been mentioned?

2. It will appear, that copies of the Gospels were dispersed in the apostles' time into distant countries, and did not lie in the coffers or chests of any private persons; if we consider that they are made use of, and referred to, by all those who are reputed to be writers of the apostolic age, except Hermas, whose design did not at all lead him to cite them. The writers I mean (which are indeed the only ones we have) are Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, Ignatius, and Polycarp; each of which (though they lived in very distant countries) had, and made use of, those Gospels, which were published when they wrote their Epistles. I mean the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke; for, as far as I have observed, they do none of them cite, or so much as refer to, any thing which is in St. John's

[i] Πολλοῖς μὲν Ῥωμαίων τοῖς συμπεπολεμηκόσι, πολλοῖς δὲ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐπίπρασκον, ἀνδράσι καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς σοφίας μετισχηκόσιν. Contra Appion. l. 1. §. 9.

Gospel; which, by the way, seems somewhat like an argument that these Epistles were written before that Gospel.

Mr. Dodwell, in the Dissertation just now mentioned, would persuade us, that the writers of the apostolic age have made no use in their books of the Gospels, or other writings of the New Testament. This is most apparently false, as any one may easily perceive who will read those books with this view. It is sufficient to my present purpose, to shew that St. Matthew's Gospel is cited by these writers.

A table of places cited out of St. Matthew's Gospel by the apostolic fathers.

I. Clemens Romanus, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. 13, advises them to remember several of our Lord's sayings, which are recited by St. Matthew, chap. vi. 14, and vii. 1, 2, 12.

II. Barnabas, ch. 4, cites Matth. ch. xx. 16, and xxii. 14.

Ch. 5, he refers to Matth. ix. 13.

Ch. 5, he cites a prophecy out of Zechariah, ch. xiii. 7, in words different both from the Hebrew and the Septuagint, but exactly the same with our Saviour's words, as related by St. Matthew, ch. xxvi. 31.

Ch. 7, he cites Matth. xxvii. 54.

Ch. 19, he refers to Matth. v. 42.

III. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, ch. 2, cites Matth. vii. 1. and v. 3, 10.

Ch. 6, he cites Matth. vi. 12, 14.

Ch. 7, he cites Matth. vi. 13. and xxvi. 41.

IV. Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Smyrneans, ch. 1, cites Matth. iii. 15.

In his Epistle to Polycarp, ch. 2, he cites Matth. x. 16.

In his Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. 14, he cites Matth. xii. 33. These are reckoned among his genuine Epistles.

By a careful observing of these writings with this view, perhaps there may be found several other places of this Gospel referred to in them. Those now cited are sufficient to prove, that this Gospel was widely dispersed in the apostles' time, and made use of in very distant countries; for Clemens wrote his Epistle from Rome, Barnabas from Cyprus, Polycarp from

Smyrna, Ignatius from Antioch; and these were places widely distant from each other. If then these Gospels were thus in the hands of all those of that age, whose writings we now have, it is very reasonable to suppose they were also in the hands of innumerable others.

I would only add, that in the Constitutions, which Mr. Whiston supposes to be *the apostles'*, and collected by Clemens, this Gospel is frequently cited, and recommended among the other sacred Gospels to the perusal of all Christians; which would have been very absurd, if the Gospels were not dispersed and spread abroad in the world.

3. This matter will be further confirmed, if we consider how much it was the practice of the first Christians to read the scriptures. St. Paul's Epistles were wont to be publicly read in the churches to which they were written, and other churches too, as is plain from those words, Col. iv. 16. *And when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.* Timothy has this character given him by St. Paul, *that he from a child had made the scriptures his study*, 2 Tim. iii. 15. It seems to me very probable, that he means here both the scriptures of the New and Old Testament; for he gives them this character, *that they were able to make him wise unto salvation;* which character at that time did most properly belong to the books of the New Testament, which were then written. Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, tells them, "he did not doubt but they were con-" versant with the sacred scriptures." The last canon of the apostles obliges all laity and clergy, "to procure the sacred " books, both of the Old and New Testament;" and b. 1. c. 5. the Christians are required "diligently to read the Gospels[k]." This is authority, which Mr. Whiston will not dispute. If then the Christians did, and were obliged to read the Gospels, they did not lie concealed and unknown till the times of Trajan or Hadrian.

I would only add here, that reading the Gospels was one part of the public service of the primitive Christians, in their religious assemblies. It is certain that a great part of the

[k] Διέρχου ἐπιμελῶς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον.

Jewish worship in their synagogues, consisted in reading of the law [l]. Josephus tells us, that "they did this in obedience to the "command of Moses [m]." Now it is well known that the Christians conformed themselves very much in their worship to the customs of the Jews. Justin Martyr [n], who lived but a little while after the apostles' time, tells us, "That on the day which is "called Sunday, there was an assembly of all that lived (near) "in town or country, in the same place; and the historical "memoirs of the apostles (i. e. the Gospels) and the writings "of the prophets were read."

Now from all this I think it is evident a great number of copies of this Gospel were spread abroad in the world in the apostles' time. These, as has been proved, were in their right order, in which St. Matthew wrote; and since it is impossible but some of those copies that are in the world must be derived from some of these, and since all the copies that are in the world are in the same order with our present copies; it necessarily follows, this part of St. Matthew's Gospel has not been misplaced or disordered since the apostles' time.

CHAP. XXIII.

St. Matthew's Gospel, in our present copies, was not disordered and misplaced since the apostles' time; because the Syriac version, which was made in the apostles' time, is in the same order with our present copies. An attempt to prove that the Syriac version was made in that time. Syriac was the language of the Jews in the apostles' time. Great numbers of Jews were converted to Christianity, and therefore needed a version in that language.

BY what has been said in the foregoing chapter, it is evident St. Matthew's Gospel was not misplaced since the apostles' time: the same will be further proved, if we consider,

[l] Luke iv. 16, 17. and Acts xv. 21.

[m] Ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφειμένους, ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἐκέλευσε (sc. Moses) συλλέγεσθαι. Contra Appion. l. 2. §. 17.

[n] Καὶ τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, πάντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγροὺς μένοντων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσις γίνεται, καὶ τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγινώσκεται. Apol. 2. p. 98.

2. That the Syriac version, which seems to have been made in the apostles' time, is exactly in the same order in this part of St. Matthew's Gospel, with our present copies. This is an argument which undeniably proves the point I am contending for, if it can be made appear that this version was made in that time. It is not to be expected we should have as clear evidence of this, as we have of some other matters of fact in the apostolic times; because of the vast number of Jews, who were at first converted to Christianity, and who made use of this version, there is not one (except the apostles) who has wrote any thing which is come down to our present time. Nevertheless, I hope to make it at least probable, that this version was made in the time of the apostles. In order to which, I will shew,

1. That Syriac was the language in use among the Jews in our Saviour's and the apostles' time.

2. That it was very necessary a version should be made, and very likely a version was made, of the New Testament into this language in the apostles' time.

3. That it is probable this version, which we now have, is the same which was then made.

1. The Syriac was the language in common use among the Jews in the time of our Saviour and his apostles. Till the Jews were carried captives to Babylon, they undoubtedly retained their own language, viz. the pure Hebrew, and understood not Syriac, as is plain from 2 Kings xviii. 26. and Jer. v. 15. Being at Babylon for seventy years, they learnt the language of the country, which afterwards they never lost. "This "was a place," says the great Bochart[o], "always fatal to the "Hebrew language." That which they learnt was not very much different from the Hebrew, though it went under a different name, and was called sometimes Chaldee, and sometimes Syriac: so Dan. i. 4. it is called ולשון כשדים, i.e. *the tongue of the Chaldeans;* and ch. ii. 4. the same is called Syriac; *the Chaldeans spake to the king* ארמית, i. e. *in the Syriac tongue.*

[o] Eadem Babylon, ubi cæteræ linguæ natæ sunt, semper Hebraicæ fuit fatalis, semel in confusione linguarum, et rursus cum Judæi ibi captivi patrium sermonem didicerunt. Phaleg. l. 1. c. 15.

See to the same purpose Dr. Prideaux, Connect. of the Hist. of the Old and New Test. part 1. b. 5. and part 2. b. 8.

It was this (perhaps a little altered) in which our Saviour and his apostles conversed [p], and the Jews generally, in their time: for the proof of this, I shall only allege a few places out of the New Testament; the great number of Syriac words, that are to be found therein, do sufficiently prove it, viz. such as *Talitha Kumi* [q], *Ephphatha* [r], *Eloi Eloi lama sabachthani* [s], *Bethesda* [t], *Golgotha* [u], *Gabbatha* [x], *Raca* [y], *Cephas* [z], *Aceldama* [a], *Boanerges* [b], *Maran-atha* [c], *Bar-Jona* [d], *Abba* [e], &c. These are all evidently Syriac words, (as they know who are acquainted with this language,) which were used by the Jews in and about our Saviour's time. I would only observe concerning one of these Syriac words, viz. the word *Aceldama*, that it is said to be ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, i. e. *in their own dialect or language.* It is true indeed that two or three of these words are called Hebrew, so John v. 2. ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδὰ, *which is called in Hebrew Bethesda*, and John xix. 13. Ἑβραϊστὶ Γαββαθᾶ, i. e. *in Hebrew Gabbatha.* But it is a very trite and common observation, that Syriac and Chaldee are frequently called Hebrew; whence Nonnus, in his Greek Paraphrase on John, translates Ἑβραϊστὶ, Σύρῳ μύθῳ, in the last place cited; and ver. 17, he renders the same word Σύρων στόμα. So Philo [f] and the fathers commonly call Chaldee and Syriac, Hebrew. Nor is this strange, when we consider that Hebrew was the old language from which these two dialects (very little different from it) are derived.

The old Hebrew was so far from being the language of the country at this time, that they had now, and for a long time before had, an officer in the synagogues, called מתורגמן, whose business it was, when the Old Testament was read, to

[p] Is vero Syrorum sermo, Christi et apostolorum temporibus, propter diuturnam illam in Babylone captivitatem, et Assyriorum contra in Judæam translationem, genti Hebraicæ popularis fuit et vernaculus, adeo ut nulli tunc scirent Hebraice, nisi qui singulari studio ex libris didicissent. Quamobrem Christum quoque et apostolos eodem sermone popularibus suis locutos fuisse, cum ipsa ratio, tum in Græco relictæ voces Syriacæ, satis evincunt. Tremell. Præfat. in Test. Syriac.

[q] Mark v. 41.

[r] Mark vii. 34.

[s] Mark xv. 34.

[t] John v. 2.

[u] Matt. xxvii. 33.

[x] John xix. 13.

[y] Matt. v. 22.

[z] John i. 42.

[a] Acts i. 19.

[b] Mark iii. 17.

[c] 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

[d] Matt. xvi. 17.

[e] Mark xiv. 36.

[f] Vid. Casaub. ad Baron. Annal. c. 16. §. 11.

translate the Hebrew, and give the people the sense of it, period by period, in Chaldee or Syriac [g]. Hence also it was that the חרגומים, i. e. *the Chaldee translations* of the Old Testament were made in or before our Saviour's time.

There has been a controversy between the learned Mr. Vossius and Father Simon, concerning the language the Jews spake at this time. The former pretends, that Greek was [h] then the language of the Jews; but Father Simon has sufficiently shewn the weakness of his arguments [i]. It seems to me very evident, the common Jews did not at all understand Greek. It was indeed the language most known in the world; (much more perhaps than either Latin or French are now;) and for that reason, as has been said, the books of the New Testament were wrote in it: but the common Jews were not acquainted with it; and therefore St. Paul, when he was apprehended at Jerusalem, though he spake to the officer (who perhaps was a Roman) *in Greek;* (Acts xxi. 37.) yet, when he made his speech to the people, he spake ἐν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, *in the Hebrew tongue*, or, which is the same, (as has been proved,) *in the Syriac*. He knew the people could not understand him in any other; and so we find, that, when he spake no more Greek, but in their own language, they diligently hearkened to him, ch. xxii. 2. Hence Josephus tells us, that he wrote his history first in Hebrew, or Syriac, for the use of his countrymen; but afterwards, that it might be of more extensive use, translated it into Greek: though (as he says a little after) he was very backward to that work, *because it was a language very different from that of his country* [k].

2. This being the language of the Jews in our Saviour's time, it was very necessary a version should be made, and consequently likely a version was made, of the New Testament into this language, before the apostles' death. Although the body and greatest part of the Jews rejected Christianity, yet there were very considerable numbers of them that embraced it. We read, Acts xxi. 22. of many (μυριάδες), *ten thousands*

[g] Dr. Lightfoot, Harm. of the Gospels, year 31. §. 23.

[h] Voss. Respons. ad iterat. P. Simon object.

[i] Critic. Hist. of the New Test. part 1. c. 6.

[k] Εἰς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἡμῖν καὶ ξένης διαλέκτου συνήθειαν. Præfat. in Antiq. Jud. §. 2.

of Jews that believed, and received the doctrines of Christ. There can be no reasonable doubt, but that great additions were made to their number continually, both at Jerusalem and other parts of Judæa. And now can it be supposed that so many thousand converts should be left so long without those inspired books, which contained the foundation of their religion? Here, and here only, they could have a particular, exact, and authentic account of the doctrines of that religion which they had embraced; and is it not likely they would endeavour to get these books translated into their own language? Either the apostles or themselves certainly would take care to have a version made.

I. It may reasonably be supposed that the apostles, who were so much among the Jews, would take care to have the Gospel history and their own writings published among them, in their own language. Their zeal for the interest of Christianity (which was in all respects so very great) would undoubtedly influence them to take this probable method of advancing it. Add to this, the particular fondness and affection that appeared in several of them towards their own countrymen. Nothing less than a revelation from heaven would serve to convince Peter that he might leave them, and go to preach to the Gentiles[l]. The concern St. Paul had for them and their interest was so tender and passionate, that he was even ready *to wish himself accursed from Christ*, if so be they might be happy[m]. And now, would not all this their zeal for Christianity in general, and their particular love to their countrymen, excite them to procure a version of these sacred books for their use? Nothing can be supposed which would prevent the apostles from doing this, unless we suppose they were of the same mind with the papists, viz. that the scriptures ought not to be translated into the common languages, for the use of the people. But the apostles were of a different opinion in this matter from their pretended successors, who for interest have made it religion to keep the people in ignorance. Their grand employment was to instruct men in the history and doctrines of Christ; and now was any way more likely to do this, than giving them the scriptures in their own language? The same

[l] Acts x. 9, &c. [m] Rom. ix. 3.

reason, which puts each of them upon writing in Greek, for the universal benefit of mankind, would very probably influence those of them, who were at Jerusalem, to translate their books into the language we are speaking of. Well does Tremellius argue on this head[n]; "It is altogether probable" (he is speaking of the Syriac version) "that it was made in the very beginning of Christianity, either by the apostles or some of their disciples; unless we will choose rather to believe, that in writing they had regard only to those of other nations, and very little or none at all to those of their own." But,

2. If we suppose the apostles thus negligent of the interest of the believing Jews, and not to have done this for them, we may with a great deal of reason suppose, that they would take care to have it done themselves. Every body knows how prodigiously fond the Jewish nation was of the sacred books of the Old Testament, *because they came from God;* and would not the converted Jews be likewise fond of the books of the New Testament, *which they believed also came from God?* They were careful enough to get the Hebrew of the Old Testament translated into Chaldee, and may be as reasonably supposed (I mean they who were converted) to get the Greek of the New Testament translated into Syriac. Upon the whole, I think it fair to conclude, that a version of the New Testament was made into this language in the time of the apostles.

CHAP. XXIV.

The Syriac version, which we now have, is the same which was made in the apostles' time. This proved by three arguments. The Syrians, from whom we had it, believed it to be the same. It is improbable the ancient version should be lost. It wants the parts of the New Testament, which were last written.

I HAVE attempted in the foregoing chapter to shew, that a version of the New Testament was made into Syriac in the time of the apostles; I shall now endeavour to prove,

[n] Præfat. in Vers. Syr.

3. That the Syriac version which we now have is the same which was then made. In order to which, I observe,

1. That it was constantly and universally believed by the Syrians, from whom we had this version, that it was made by St. Mark the evangelist. The truth of this depends upon the testimony of Postellus[o], a learned man, who assisted Widmanstadius in his first edition of this version; and avers, that he received this account from the Syrians themselves, when he travelled among them to acquire the knowledge of their language and customs.

2. Whether this version was made by St. Mark or not, it is very improbable that the church at Jerusalem or Antioch, or any other church, for whom the Syriac version was first made, would suffer it to be lost. There was no more probability of the Syrians losing their translation, than of the Greek churches losing their original. A church of Christians, who were in possession of so valuable a treasure, would be continually using it; its copies would be daily multiplying amongst them, and so they cannot reasonably be supposed to have lost it; they looked upon it as the word of God, though not in the language in which it was originally written, and therefore would be careful in preserving it. Every one knows how exceeding fond the Jews were of their Chaldee versions of the Old Testament. Galatinus tells us[p], they "paid the same respect to them, as to "the original itself:" and is it not likely the Christian Jews would be as careful of their translations of the New Testament, as the others were of the translations of the Old?

3. The Syriac version, which we now have, is the same which was made in the apostles' time, because it has not in it those books of the New Testament which were last written, viz. the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Revelation. These indeed have been added since this version was brought into Europe, viz. the four Epistles by Mr. Pocock, and the Revelation by De Dieu; but it is, I think, agreed by every body, even the editors themselves, that these are but modern translations. Now there can be but two probable reasons assigned, why they were wanting

[o] Guid. Fabrit. Præfat. in Syr. Test.

[p] De Arcan. Cathol. Verit. l. 1. c. 6.

in the copy brought by Moses Meridinæus into Europe, and the other ancient Syriac copies; viz. either,

1. Because they were not received into the canon, and judged authentic, when this version was made. It is certain these books were not at first received by all, but for a long time rejected by many, as Eusebius tells us [q]: or,

2. They are not in the Syriac copies, because they were not written when the Syriac version was made; and this indeed seems most probable; for had they been written then, those so useful Epistles would have been translated, for the same reason as the others. This was the argument, which, among others, convinced Tremellius [r] and the learned bishop Walton [s], that this version was made in the apostles' time. I conclude therefore, since this version has the several periods of St. Matthew's Gospel in the same order with our present copies, that they never have been disordered or misplaced.

[q] Hist. Eccl. l. 3. c. 24, 25. et l. 6. c. 25. et l. 7. c. 25.

[r] Præfat. in Nov. Test. Syr.

[s] Prolegom. in Bibl. Polyglot. 13. §. 15.

INDEX.

A.

ABDIAS, his ridiculous history of the Lives of the Apostles, i. 277.

Abgarus, king of Edessa, his epistle to Christ, with Christ's Answer, ii. 2, 3. an account of it by Eusebius and Ephraem Syrus, 4, 5. thought spurious by several learned men, 6, n. and proved so by six several arguments, 8.

Ace, Aco, Acco, Acu, were the Syriac and ancient names of Ptolemais, i. 93.

Acts of the Apostles, written by St. Luke, iii. 109. when written, 111. early translated into Hebrew, 112. proved to be canonical, because in all the ancient catalogues, ibid. cited by the primitive Christians, ibid. read in their churches, 115. received as canonical by the churches of Syria, 117. rejected by some of the earliest heretics, but without any reason assigned, 118.

Adulterous woman, history of, John viii. wanting in many ancient Greek MSS. and especially in the present Syriac version, i. 100. not an interpolation, iii. 108.

Ahmed-Ibn-Idris, a Mahometan writer, says, the Gospel of our Saviour's Infancy was used by some Christians, as the other four Gospels, ii. 143, n.

Alcoran, a collection of the histories and sayings of Christ, and things relating to him, to be found in it, i. 394, &c. Vide *Mahomet.*

Alogians, their error concerning St. John's Gospel, i. 7. affirmed St. John's Gospel to be written by Cerinthus, iii. 107.

Ambrose places the Gospel of Matthias among spurious and rejected books, i. 225. censures the Gospel of Thomas, 346, n. apocryphal books cited by him, 29. why he read them, 117, n. his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 8.

Amira, his observation on the Chaldee and Syriac languages, i. 85, n.

Ammonius, his Harmony of the Gospels, iii. 135.

Anabaptists, German, denied the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, iii. 40.

Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul the same book, i. 114. Vide *Paul.*

Andrew, his Acts and Gospels not extant, i. 107. his Acts censured as apocryphal by Eusebius, 134, n. by Philastrius, ibid. n. by Epiphanius, 135, n. by pope Gelasius, ibid. n. other books under his name declared spurious by Austin and Innocent I. 137, n. his Gospel apocryphal by Gelasius, 138, n.

Anonymous author of the works under the name of Dionysius, his catalogue of canonical books, i. 56.

Anonymous author, his fragment of the Preaching of Peter, i. 307.

Antiochus Epiphanes, his eagerness to destroy the sacred volume, iii. 256.

Apelles, an apocryphal Gospel under his name not extant, i. 107, n. nor mentioned by any writer till Jerome, 140, n. his age and principles, 141, n.

Apocryphal books extant in the apostles' times, i. 20. a catalogue of those mentioned in the second century, 26. which are not extant, ibid. of those which are extant, 33. reasons why so many were extant so early in the Christian church, ibid. what books are so, 56 - 76. some mentioned though not extant, 107—111. made out of the present canonical, 115. never appealed to by Christian writers, as of authority, 116. cited by the fathers to shew their learning, 117. or because the persons against whom they wrote did receive them, &c. ibid.

Apollonius, his account of Themison and his Epistle, i. 341.

Apostles twelve, apocryphal Gospel according to them not extant, i. 107. seems to have been a different name of Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, 114, n. an account of it by Origen, Ambrose, and Jerome, 142, 143, n. their Acts

under the names of Leucius, Lenticius, Leontius, and Leuthon, one and the same book, 210. the same with the apocryphal Acts under the names of John, Andrew, and Thomas, &c. 213.
Apotactics, a sort of heretics so called, i. 20. they esteemed the apocryphal Acts of Andrew above other scriptures, and why, 136.
Arabic, a dialect of the Old Hebrew, i. 83.
Arabic version of St. Mark, proved to be very late, by De Dieu, iii. 60.
Aristæas, his testimony that the Jewish books were written on parchment, iii. 224.
Asterius, a writer of the fourth century, his account of the brasen statue of our Saviour, erected by the woman whom he cured of the issue of blood, ii. 23, n.
Athanasius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 29. his catalogue of canonical books of the New Testament, 54, n. condemns Peter's Acts for apocryphal, 285, n. 344, n. does the like by those of Thomas, 344. as also his Gospel, 347, n. his account of a picture of Christ, presented by Nicodemus to Gamaliel, ii. 23, n. his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 8.
Athenagoras ascribes a particular saying to our Saviour, i. 381. his references to St. Matthew, iii. 30.
Austin, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 31. his catalogue of canonical books, 55. his opinion of Christ's Epistle to Peter and Paul, 168. disputation with Faustus the Manichee, 172, n. he proves the spurious Acts of the Apostles to have been written by Leucius, 213. his account of the Revelation of Paul, 278, 280, n. cites the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, ii. 54. highly commends Seneca, 66, n. he entertained a prodigious veneration for relics, 218. makes mention of Thecla, 328. his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 9. his observations on the opinion that St. John never died, 95.

B.

Babylon, in 1 Pet. v. 13. generally thought to mean Rome, iii. 58.
Baluzius, his conjecture concerning the decree of Gelasius, i. 140.
Barclay, Robert, his Apology for the Quakers, &c. noted, ii. 339.
Barnabas, his Gospel not extant, i. 107. an account of it by Gelasius, 144. two supposed fragments of it, 144, 145. another large Italian one, wherein Mahomet is named for the Paraclete, 149. therefore reasonably concluded a Mahometan forgery, 150. the author's and Dr. Mangey's conjectures concerning the original of it, 151, 152. the Epistle of, cited by ancient fathers, generally esteemed by the learned as genuine, and adjudged by some of equal authority with the books of the canon, ii. 347. the testimonies of the ancients, 348. and sentiments of the moderns concerning it, 356. this Epistle proved to be wrote by an original Gentile, 364. a remark on 1 Pet. iv. 3. p. 365. it was wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, 368. Barnabas was one of the seventy disciples, ibid. explication of John xxi. 21. and Matt. xvi. 28. p. 370. this Epistle is apocryphal, because not found in any catalogue of the sacred books of the New Testament, 372. nor cited by the primitive Christians as scripture, ibid. nor read by them as the word of God, 374. one part contradicts another, 376. it contains things which are false, 377. three visible mistakes in it produced and detected, 379. five instances of things trifling and silly, 385. it is apocryphal, because not in the Syriac version, &c. 391. a conjecture that it was forged at Alexandria by some person that corrupted the books of the sibyls, about the middle of the second century, 392. cites St. Matthew, iii. 17, 265. St. John, 102.
Baronius, his high opinion of the Nazarene Gospel, i. 249, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, ii. 68, n. esteems the history of Paul and Thecla as genuine, 330, n. his opinion that St. Mark wrote in Latin, confuted, iii. 59.
Bartholomew, his writings and Gospel not extant, i. 107. seems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, 114. the book under his name proved spurious, 153. and by Jerome and Gelasius accounted apocryphal, 154, n. is the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew interpolated, ibid. n.
Baruch, book of, its error concerning the captivity, i. 9.

Basilides, his error concerning the crucifixion of Christ, i. 11, n. his Gospel not extant, 107, 159. only just cited among the apocryphal books by Origen, Ambrose, and Jerome, 157, n. his age and tenets, ibid. n. his commentaries, &c. 158.
Baxter, Mr. a citation from him concerning people's remissness in inquiring into the genuineness of the scriptures, i. 13.
Beda, his sentiments of the Hebrew or Nazarene Gospel, i. 248, n.
Bellarmine rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, ii. 68, n. his opinion that St. Mark wrote in Latin, confuted, iii. 59.
Bentley, his remark concerning the various readings in the scriptures, iii. 257.
Bernard, Dr. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 427. his assertion that it was read in the churches, together with canonical books, refuted, 443, n.
Beza, his opinion that St. Paul wrote several other Epistles besides those we now have, i. 123, 124, n. of a saying of Christ mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. p. 357, n. his opinion on John ii. 11. vol. ii. 202, n.
Bibliander. Vide *Postellus*.
Bishop, this word and Presbyter, titles of the same person in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, iii. 93, n.
Burnet, bishop, a citation out of him concerning the necessity of tradition to establish the canon of the New Testament, i. 52, n.

C.

Caianites, a sect of the Gnostics, &c. i. 209. forged a piece under the name of Judas, ibid. their tenets, ibid. n.
Cajetan questioned the authority of the Revelation, i. 8.
Caius, presbyter of Rome, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 28.
Calvin questioned the authority of the Revelation, i. 8. supposed St. Paul to have written more Epistles than we now have, 123, 124, n.
Canon of the New Testament more difficult to settle than that of the Old, i. 2, 3. the original of the word, and when first applied to scripture, 17, 18. primitive Christians did well agree about books canonical, 36. and did generally receive the same for such, as we do now, ibid. tradition of the ancients, the principal method of determining it, 48. a demonstrative indication of a true canon, 57. canonical books, which, ibid. none of them lost, 118. a noted objection to this answered, 121. the bare citation of a book in sacred writings does not prove it canonical, 122.
Canterbury, present archbishop of, a citation out of him concerning the apostolical fathers, i. 5. a mistake of him in putting the word *soul* for the Greek σφραγίδα, 364. demonstrates the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus to be spurious, ii. 7, n. his opinion concerning St. Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans, refuted, 37. his sentiments of the Epistle of Barnabas, 361, n. an examination of his vindication of the allegories contained in that Epistle, &c. 342.
Capellus, his proof of the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, &c. i. 104, n. thought St. Paul to have wrote other Epistles than those we now have, 123, 124, n.
Carthage, council third, its catalogue of canonical books, i. 56.
Casaubon, a citation from him concerning the early rise of apocryphal books, i. 35. his opinion of the Nazarene Gospel, 249, n. a mistake of his concerning the Arabic translation of Mark iii. 21. corrected by De Dieu, ii. 206. his opinion concerning the Acts of Pilate, 281, n. he censures the Epistle of Barnabas, and the primitive fathers, for quoting, and too frequently making use of, the sibylline books, 391, n.
Cassiodorus, his conjecture concerning the Hypotyposes, i. 327, n.
Catalogues of the scriptural books in ancient writers referred to, to prove the authenticity of the four Gospels, iii. 9.
Cave, Dr. thinks the decree of Gelasius concerning apocryphal books to be spurious, i. 140, n. his mistake in thinking the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul to be two different books, 279, n. his opinion, that the Judgment of Peter was the same book with the Shepherd of Hermas, rejected, 294. his favourable sentiment of the Preaching of Peter, 310, n. his opinion concerning the history of the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 7, n. he reckons the Epistle to the Laodiceans among

the forgeries of the Manichees, 44, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, 68, n. his opinion of the Epistle of Barnabas, 428, n. exposition of John xxi. 21. p. 438, n. his explanation of what is meant by St. Mark's being called the interpreter of St. Peter, iii. 55. his opinion of St. Luke's style, 75. supposed him not to have been one of the seventy disciples, 76. his opinion of St. John's style, 101.

Cedrenus, his account of the seal which Christ affixed to his Epistle to Abgarus, ii. 6, n.

Celibacy, its doctrine confirmed out of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, ii. 330, n.

Celsus, his objection to our Saviour, as a magician, i. 171. bauters the Christians under the name of Sibyllists, 318, n.

Cerinthus, his Gospel and Revelation not extant, i. 107. seems to have been a different name for the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, 114. mentioned only by Epiphanius, 159, n. his age, tenets, &c. a story of St. John the apostle and him at Ephesus, ibid. n. he is referred to in Acts xv. ibid. his Gospel the same with the Nazarenes, 162. his Revelation mentioned only by Caius or Gaius the presbyter, 163, n. not the same as St. John's, ibid. but a ridiculous forgery compiled out of the canonical Revelation, 165, 166, n.

Chaldean language. Vide *Syriac.*

Chardin, sir John, his account of the charge of the Mahometans against the Christians for corrupting the Gospel, i. 408, n. his account of the Gospel of the Infancy of Christ, in an Armenian legend, ii. 196.

Charinus. Vide *Leucius.*

Chemnitius, his opinion of the saying of Christ mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. i. 356, n. censures the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus as spurious, ii. 7, n. his judgment on John ii. 11. p. 202, n. condemns for spurious the accounts of our Saviour's infancy, 204, n. proves that there was no adoration offered to the Virgin Mary till the fourth or fifth century, 216, n. nor relics known to the primitive Christians, 217, n. a merry story of his concerning the latter, 220.

Christ our Saviour, his Epistle to Peter and Paul, some other books under his name, an Epistle of his produced by the Manicheans, and a hymn, which they pretend he taught his disciples, not extant, i. 108, 166. not mentioned till Austin's time, except an Epistle to Abgarus, &c. ibid. that to Peter and Paul proved out of Austin to be a ridiculous forgery, 168. another book mentioned under his name, 170. he is falsely charged by the Jews and Celsus, as a magician, 171. an idle trite story of the former to the same purpose, ibid. a spurious Epistle of his among the Manichees, 172, n. a hymn forged by the Priscillianists under his name proved spurious, 174, n. a saying of his mentioned by St. Paul, 356. others ascribed to him in the Epistle of Barnabas, 357. others by Clemens, supposed to be the same mentioned by St. Paul, 359. a fragment in his name cited by Irenæus, 362, n. a discourse ascribed to him by Papias, 368. another by the same, 369, a saying of his out of Justin Martyr, 370. history of his baptism by the same, 373. another concerning him in his younger years, by the same, 375. a saying of him in Irenæus, 378. history of his age in the same, ibid. a saying ascribed to him in Athenagoras, and a continuation of it by Pfaffius, 381. another by Clemens Alexandrinus, 382. another by the same, 386. another cited by most of the ancient fathers, 383. history of him and his parents by Origen, 387. of his relations according to the flesh in Epiphanius, 388. an answer of the apostles to him in Jerome, 390. histories and sayings of, and things relating to him, to be found in the Alcoran of Mahomet, 394. four particular sayings ascribed to him by the Mahometan doctors, 411. an Epistle under his name to an Arabian king, translated out of Syriac into Greek, and preserved in the writings of Eusebius, ii. 1, n. 4. an account of the seal (consisting of seven Hebrew letters) which he used, &c. 6, n. these Epistles esteemed by several learned men spurious and apocryphal, 7, n. and proved by several arguments to be so, 8. the main objection concerning it answered, 16. a conjecture that the history of these Epistles is an interpolation into the works of Eusebius, with several ar-

guments to support it, 17. a fragment concerning Christ's picture, which he sent to Abgarus, taken out of the Orthodoxographa, 19. a relation of a miracle wrought by it, 20, n. the story of this picture was common among the writers of the sixth and following centuries, ibid. a digression out of monsieur Durant, concerning four pictures of Christ, made during his life on earth, 21. a prayer of his (probably a Mahometan forgery) different from that in the Gospels, 24. proved spurious, 25, n.

Christ's Infancy, the Gospel of, published and translated by Mr. Henry Sike, at Utrecht, in 1697, ii. 142. another under the name of Thomas, out of Cotelerius's notes on the Constitutions of the Apostles, who printed it out of a MS. in the French king's library, 187. these seem to be originally the same, 191. the ancient Gospel of Thomas different from this of the Infancy of Christ, 192. they are mentioned by the ancients as two distinct books, &c. ibid. Christ's Infancy a forgery of the Gnosticks, 193. received by the Marcosians in the second century, 194. known to Mahomet, and made use of by the compilers of the Alcoran, ibid. contained in the legends of the Persians, 196, n. they are apocryphal, and not received by the ancient Christians, 199. the design of them false, ibid. proved from scripture, and the universal silence of the first Christian writers, 200. and from St. John's Gospel, ch. ii. 11. p. 201. that text critically discussed, 202. intimations in scripture that Christ wrought no miracles in his infancy, 205. this positively asserted by several fathers, 207, n. these Gospels proved apocryphal from the trifling stories, and many falsities in them contained, 209. because they contain things later than the time in which they pretend to be written, 213. because of the prodigious respect paid by them to the Virgin Mary, 214. the opinions of Dr. Mill, Mr. La Crose, and the author, concerning these Gospels, 220, n.

Chrysostom makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. i. 100. asserts the first miracle wrought by Christ was in Cana of Galilee, and calls the miracles ascribed to his infancy, forgery and lies, ii. 208, n. he entertained a great veneration for relics, 218. cites the Acts of Pilate, 278, n. mentions the Acts of Paul and Thecla, 329, n. his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 9. his argument on their disagreement, 153.

Clarke, Dr. a mistake of his concerning Mr. Dodwell, rectified, i. 4, n.

Clarke, Dr. S. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 362, n. refuted, 372.

Clemens Alexandrinus, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 27. makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. p. 100. his testimonies of the Gospel of the Egyptians, 177, n. his interpretation of 1 Cor. vii. 1. and 1 Tim. iv. 3. p. 187, n. mentions the traditions of Matthias, 226. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 237, n. does not appeal to the Hebrew Gospel as of any authority, 260. cites fragments of the Preaching of Peter, 301. observation on the Hypotyposes of Clemens, &c. 323, n. that book not his, 326. the citation of it by Theodotus examined, 327. his testimonies concerning Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 348. his copies corrupted, and Barnabas inserted for Clemens Romanus, 353. he had too high an opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, 373. yet contradicts it, 374. continually cites the four Gospels now received, iii. 7. his account of St. Matthew's temperance, 12. his citations of him, 31. of St. Mark, 66. of St. Luke, 86. of St. John, 105. ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke, 109. cites them, 114. his account of St. Mark's Gospel recorded by Eusebius, 161.

Clemens Romanus, contemporary with St. Paul, his testimony of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, contrary to the opinions of many modern learned men, i. 125. cites St. Matthew, iii. 18. 264. St. Luke, 84. St. John, 102. the Acts of the Apostles, 112.

Cleobius, author of several apocryphal books, i. 35.

Le Clerc, Mr. his opinion of several Epistles of St. Paul, not extant, and sanguine remark on those that are, examined, i. 123. his sentiments of the Egyptian Gospel, 181. censure of Dr. Grabe, 186, n. his opinion the same with Dr. Whitby's concerning

the Nazarene Gospel, 253, n. censures the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus for spurious, ii. 7, n. his opinion upon the text, Col. iv. 16. refuted, 36. his opinion concerning the Acts of Pilate, 282, n. concerning Barnabas's Epistle, 363.
Cocus condemns as spurious the whole story and Epistle of Christ to Abgarus, ii. 7, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, 68.
Collins, Dr. was of opinion that St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians, previous to those two extant, i. 124. his observation on John ii. 11. ii. 202, n.
Collyridiani, whence so named, ii. 215.
Constantine emperor, cites a Greek acrostic concerning Christ, i. 318, n.
Corinthians, a spurious Epistle of theirs to Paul, and another of Paul to them, i. 130, 131.
Cosin, Dr. a mistake of his rectified, i. 50.
Cotelerius, his fragment of the Infancy of Christ, ii. 187. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, 359.
La Crose, monsieur, cites a synod held in the diocese of Angamala, in the mountains of Malabar, A. D. 1599. which condemns the Gospels of Christ's Infancy, &c. ii. 143, n. 220, n. his opinion of those Gospels, ibid. n.
Cross, the practice of signing with, by whom first mentioned, ii. 295, 342.
Cyprian, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 28. his account of the Christian meetings, 60. makes mention of Thecla, ii. 327.
Cyril, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 29. his catalogue of canonical books, 54. instructions to his catechumen concerning the scriptures, 60, n. his distinction of books canonical, and such as were doubted of, 62, n. account of the Gospel of Scythianus, 335, n. censure of the Gospel of Thomas, as the Gospel of one of the Manichees of the same name, 346, n. his testimony concerning St. Matthew's Gospel, iii. 35.

D.

Daillé, Mons. demonstrates the spuriousness of a book, under the name of Bartholomew, mentioned by the supposed Dionysius the Areopagite, i. 153. a mistake of his rectified by bishop Pearson, ibid. n. another concerning Bartholomew's Gospel, 156. he thinks the Epistles of Ignatius to be spurious, 259. shews that the fathers were often mistaken, iii. 240.
Daniel the prophet, a citation out of him, whereby the Chaldee and Syriac languages seem to be synonymous, i. 85.
Darius Comes, in an Epistle to Austin, seems to refer to the letters of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 6, n.
De Dieu, his observation on the affinity of the Chaldee and Syriac languages, i. 85, n. corrects a mistake of Casaubon in the Arabic translation of Mark iii. 21. vol. ii. 205, n.
Dionysius Alexandrinus, thought the style of St. John's Gospel pure and elegant, iii. 101.
Dionysius the Areopagite, one of St. Paul's converts at Rome, i. 153, n.
Docetæ, a branch of the Gnostick heretics, i. 291. supposed to forge Peter's Gospel, which likely may be the same as the Gospel of Basilides, ibid.
Dodwell, Mr. a false opinion of his concerning the books of the present canon, espoused by Mr. Toland, refuted, i. 38, n. 120. he thinks Peter's Gospel was a forgery of the Docetæ, 291. his account of the age of Tatian, 340, n. a mistake of his concerning the promiscuous use of the Gospels and apocryphal books by the fathers of the first century, 357, n. 361. 366. his opinion of the Epistle of Barnabas, and of Hermes, ii. 360, n. his opinion that the first Christian writers had no certain canon, which they cited, iii. 14. his mistake in supposing that none of our Gospels were cited by the early fathers, 26. 265. and that the Gospels lay a long time concealed, 262. argues that the evangelists could not have seen the writings of each other, 183.
Doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, various opinions of it, i. 103.
Drusius, his proof of the doxology, &c. i. 104. his opinion of the supposed lost pieces of Paul, 123, 124, n.
Du Pin, Mr. the only person who has purposely written on the canon of the New Testament, i. 15. defects in his performance, 16. his mistake about the word Eucharist, 103, n. another concerning the time of the Syriac version, ibid. his censure of

the Egyptian Gospel, 180, n. of the Gospel of Eve; and a mistake of his, 200, n. his sentiments of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 250, n. his opinion of the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 279, n. a mistake of his concerning Philip's Gospel rectified, 335. opposed the tradition that St. Luke was one of the seventy disciples, iii. 76.

Durant, monsieur, a digression out of him concerning several pictures of Christ, made during his life on earth, ii. 21.

E.

Eachard, Mr. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, ii. 68, n. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistles, 362, n.

Ebionites, what part of the New Testament they rejected, i. 7. the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles made use of by them, 108. not extant, ibid. seems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, 114. 194. their apocryphal Acts, 197. their Gospel the same with the Nazarenes, &c. 198. they used the Acts of Peter, 285, n. esteemed St. Paul their great enemy, 314. they and the Nazarenes always declared heretics by the catholic church, ibid.

Egyptians, their apocryphal Gospel not extant, i. 108. testimonies of the ancients and fragments of it, 176. sentiments of modern writers concerning it, 179. five arguments proving it apocryphal, 182. it was never cited nor appealed to by Clemens, 183. but utterly rejected by him, 185. composed by early heretics, and probably Egyptians, 186, 193. their Therapeutæ bore a great agreement with the Essenes, 191.

Elxai, or Elxæus, a false prophet about the time of Trajan, A. C. 114. founder of the sect of the Helkesaites, &c. i. 202.

Encratites, apocryphal Gospel of, not extant, i. 108. esteemed the spurious Acts of Andrew above all other scriptures, and why, 136.

Ephraem Syrus mentions the Epistles of Abgarus to Christ, and Christ's answer, ii. 5.

Epiphanius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 30. his catalogue of canonical books, 55. his censure of the apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 135, n. of the Egyptian Gospel, 178. he the only ancient writer that mentions the Acts of the Apostles, received by the Ebionites, 194. and the Gospel of Eve, 298, n. his censure of the Helkesaites, 202, n. account of the Gospel of Judas Iscariot, 208. of the Encratites, Apotactics, and Origenians, 216. a mistake of his concerning the Lucianists rectified, 222. he charges the Ebionites with forging books under St. Matthew's name, 224. mentions the Gospel of Marcion, 233, n. his doubt whether Merinthus and Cerinthus were not one and the same person, 234. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 239, n. declares Paul's Revelation a forgery, 278, n. his opinion of the Anabaticon of Paul, 280. rejects the Acts of Peter as spurious, 285, n. his account of the Gospel of Scythianus, 335, n. his account of the principles of Tatian, 339, n. cites the Acts of Thomas, 344, n. his history of Christ according to the flesh, 388. a notorious error in our present copies of him concerning Marcion's Evangelium and Apostolicon, ii. 23, n. he esteemed the miracles of Christ's infancy to be fables, 207. a relation from him about some silly women, who first sacrificed to the Virgin Mary, 215. his account of Thecla, 328.

Erasmus, questioned the authority of the Revelation, i. 8. says the history of the adulterous woman was wanting in most Greek copies, &c. 110, n. his acknowledgment of finding the doxology at the end of the Lord's prayer in all the Greek copies, 103, n. sentiments of the Gospel of the Nazarenes, Thomas, Matthias, the Egyptians, twelve apostles, and Nicodemus, 179, n. his opinion that the Epistle to the Laodiceans was stolen out of the Epistle to the Colossians, ii. 42, n. he attempts to prove the Epistle spurious from its style, 43.

Essenes, the great agreement between them and the Egyptian Christians, i. 190.

Estius condemns for spurious the accounts of the miracles wrought by Christ in his infancy, ii. 204, n. accounts for St. Mark's having omitted several circumstances honourable to St. Peter, iii. 57. 163, n.

Euagrius confirms a story of the city

of Edessa, that it should never be taken, &c. ii. 6, n. relates a surprising miracle wrought by Christ's picture, which he sent to Abgarus, 20.
Eucharist, in what sense the word is used by Justin Martyr, i. 103, n.
Eve, apocryphal Gospel of, not extant, i. 108. has been observed by several modern, though only by Epiphanius among the ancient writers, 198, n. proved to be a forgery of the Gnosticks, 200.
Eusebius, his account of several books of the New Testament not received by some who were not heretics in the first ages, i. 8, n. 238. apocryphal books mentioned by him, 28. his catalogue of canonical books, 54. method of distinguishing between books which are, or are not to be received, 57—62, n. he excludes the Shepherd of Hermas from the canon, 63, n. censures the apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 134, n. his account of a piece wrote by Agrippa Castor against Basilides, 158. he declares the Acts of Peter, Thomas, &c. to be heretical forgeries, 214, n. ranks the Gospel of Matthias among heretical books, 225. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 236, 238. he makes no use (as Mr. Toland falsely supposes) of the Nazarene Gospel, 262, n. rejects the Acts of Paul as spurious, 275. and the Acts of Peter as not canonical, 284, n. as also his Gospel, 289, n. a fragment from him of the Preaching of Peter, 308. he rejects Peter's Revelation as not canonical and spurious, 324, n. 331. is wrongfully charged by Toland and others with self-contradictions, 329, n. mentions the Gospel of Thomas as heretical, 346, n. cites an Epistle of our Saviour to an Arabian king, ii. 1, n. a character of Eusebius by Scaliger and others, 16. he says he saw a brass statue of our Saviour at Cæsarea Philippi, 22. as also the pictures of Peter and Paul, ibid. he appeals to the Acts of Pilate, 279, n. three citations out of him, proving those Acts to be pagan forgeries, 286. a short account from him of Thecla, 328. his testimonies concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, 354. his testimony that the three former Gospels were approved by St. John, iii. 1. 259. expressly excludes from the canon all but the four Gospels now received, 8. his account of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel, 12. fixes the time of it, 41. 261. an accurate chronologer and historian, 44. accounts for St. Mark's having omitted several circumstances honourable to St. Peter, 57. his testimony concerning St. Luke's Gospel, 179. composed a Harmony, 135.
Eutychius Alexandrinus, his testimony that St. Mark wrote in Latin, of no weight, iii. 60.
Ezra, settled the canon of the Jews, i. 2.

F.

Faber, Tanaquillus, his opinion concerning the Acts of Pilate, ii. 282, n.
Fabricius, Mr. observes that in some copies of Gelasius's decree of apocryphal books, there is no mention of Andrew's Gospel, i. 138, n. he made a collection of apocryphal books under our Saviour's name, 166. a mistake of his concerning the traditions of Matthias rectified, 229, n. his nice distinction between the contents of those traditions and a Gospel, 230. he censures Mr. Toland, and condemns the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 252, n. his mistake in supposing the Anabaticon and Paul's Revelation to be different books, 280, n. produces a large fragment of Philip's Acts, 333, n. his observation on the Orthodoxographa, 340, n. mistake concerning the Acts of Thomas, 345, n. another concerning the citations of the fathers of the first century, 358, n. his censure on the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 7, n. he was of opinion that the Epistle to the Laodiceans was stolen out of the Epistle to the Philippians, 43, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, 68, n. his collection of the sentiments of protestants and papists concerning the Protevangelion, 141. he takes the Gospel of Thomas for the Infancy of Christ, 144, n. his opinion of the Acts of Pilate, 282.
Fathers, often mistaken, iii. 239. their ignorance of Hebrew, 243. their error in supposing St. Matthew to have written in that language, 244.
Faustus, his objection to the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, iii. 39.
Fell, bishop, his sentiments concerning Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 360, n. his

vindication of the allegories contained in that Epistle, examined, &c.
Fuller, his observation on the affinity of the Chaldee and Syriac languages, i. 85, n.

G.

Gelasius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 32. his censure of the Acts of Andrew, 135, n. famous decree concerning apocryphal books, 139, n. thought to have been formed at Rome, A. C. 494. though some ascribe it to Damasus, and others to Hormisdas; whence Baluzius conjectures it to have been begun by Damasus, renewed by Gelasius, and continued by Hormisdas, 140. he censures the book of Leucius for apocryphal, 216, n. and the Gospel of Matthias for the same, 225. mentions the Acts of Thecla and Paul, 274, n. condemns their Revelation as apocryphal, 279, n. rejects the books under the name of Peter, called the books of Clemens, as apocryphal, 286, n. as also the Gospel under the same name, 289, n. mentions the Revelation of Stephen as such, 337. does the like by the Acts of Thomas, his Gospel and Revelation, 344, n. 347, n. 348, n. rejects as apocryphal and spurious, the Epistle under the name of Christ to Abgarus, ii. 6, n. and also the Gospel of Thomas, and the book of Christ's Infancy, 192. declares the Acts of Paul and Thecla apocryphal, 326, n.
Gnosticks, forge the Gospel of Perfection, i. 332, n. a forgery of theirs mentioned by Irenæus concerning Christ, 377.
Gospels, had not the present titles prefixed to them by their authors, i. 155, n. only four acknowledged by the primitive Christians, and those genuine, iii. 1. their order in many early writers the same as at present, 81. different in the Cambridge MS. ibid. a great many copies of them spread abroad before the death of the apostles, 260. read in the assemblies of the primitive Christians on Sunday, 267.
Grabe, Dr. produces a supposed fragment of the Gospel of Barnabas out of an old MS. in the Bodleian library, i. 144, n. but gives no reason in support of his conjecture concerning it, 145. his error concerning the Revelation of St. John and Cerinthus, 163, n. opinion of the Gospel of the Egyptians, 180, n. his too fond opinion of apocryphal books, 186. a mistake of his in supposing the Gospel of Matthias to be the same with the traditions, 225, n. 229. his collection of the fragments of Matthias's Gospel, 226. of the Gospel of the Nazarenes or Hebrews, 239, n. his sentiments of the latter, 250, n. a mistake of his concerning Hegesippus, 260, n. another concerning Origen, 261. an absurdity of his in supposing the Nazarene to be previous to St. Matthew's Gospel, 269. his acts of Paul and Thecla taken out of a MS. in the Bodleian library, 274, n. his distinction between the Acts of Paul and Thecla, and the Acts of Paul only, 276. an error of his rectified, ibid. another concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 279. his account of a MS. now extant in Merton college, entitled, the Revelation of Paul, 284, n. his conjecture concerning the judgment of Peter, rectified, 296. too great opinion of the Preaching of Peter, 310, n. he would have Peter's Revelation equally orthodox with that of John, 325, n. wrongfully charges Eusebius with self-contradiction, 329, n. his false conclusion from a passage out of Sozomen of the Revelation of Peter, 330, n. he supposes Peter's Revelation to be a prophecy concerning the state of the Jews and the Christian church, ibid. n. his arguments for the Epistle of Christ to Abgarus, ii. 7, n. he esteems the history of Paul and Thecla as true and genuine, 330. contradicts himself, 335. supposes the first Christian writers to have cited no certain canon, iii. 14.
Greek language, its extensive use in the time of the apostles, iii. 59. 249.
Greek Catena of the twenty-three fathers on John, has not the history of the adulterous woman, i. 100, n.
Gregory, Mr. his account of a third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, i. 26. excellent observation of the genuineness of the doxology at the end of the Lord's prayer, 104, n. and from the form of prayer out of the tradition of the elders, ibid.
Gregory Nazianzen, his catalogue of canonical books, i. 55. makes men-

tion of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, ii. 329, n.
Grotius, his opinion of the time of the Syriac version rectified, i. 103, n. asserts that St. Paul wrote several other Epistles besides those we now have, 124, n. his conjecture concerning the Revelation of St. John and Cerinthus, 166, n. sentiments of the Egyptian Gospel, 176, n. of the Nazarene Gospel, 249, n. is of opinion with Tertullian, that the Epistle, now entitled to the Ephesians, was formerly entitled to the Laodiceans, ii. 34, n. refuted, 37. his observation on the text John ii. 11. p. 202. his arguments about the Acts of Pilate, 282, n. mistaken in supposing Matthew and Levi to be different persons, iii. 10. assigns a reason why the last part of St. Mark's Gospel was wanting in some Greek copies, 72. his opinion of St. John's style, 101. his conjecture, that the last chapter of St. John's Gospel was not written by him, without foundation, 108.
Grynæus, his oversight and mistake about the Protevangelion, ii. 140.

H.

Hammond, Dr. believes the present Epistle to the Ephesians was formerly entitled to the Laodiceans, ii. 34, n. this opinion refuted, 38. his exposition of John xxi. 21. p. 370. his observation on the disagreement of the Gospels, iii. 154. his argument to shew that St. Mark's Gospel was written from the account of St. Peter, 58. 164.
Harmony of the four Gospels composed by Tatian, i. 338. that of the Orthodoxographa not the same with Tatian's, 340, n. iii. 135.
Hebrew the first language of the world, i. 82. its various dialects, 83.
Hebrew, apocryphal Gospel of, not extant, i. 108. was sometimes called the Gospel of the Nazarenes, and sometimes of the Ebionites, 115. Gospel according to the, possessed by the Nazarenes or Ebionites, iii. 240. written in Hebrew, and supposed by them to be the true Gospel of St. Matthew, 241. the same opinion held by many, 242. but shewn to be false, 245. made use of by Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome only, 244. Vide *Nazarenes*.
Hegesippus, contemporary with Justin Martyr, i. 24. mentions the Gospel according to the Hebrews, 26. 236. cites not the Gospel of the Nazarenes, as Dr. Grabe and Mr. Toland wrongfully think, 260.
Heinsius, his opinion of the saying of Christ, mentioned by St. Paul, Acts xx. 35. vol. i. 356.
Helkesaites, what part of the New Testament they rejected, i. 7. 201. their apocryphal books not extant, 108. seem to derive their name from Elxai, or Elxæus, who lived about the year 114. p. 202. they are esteemed by Epiphanius as neither Jews, Christians, nor heathens, ibid. they were generally of the Jewish nation, 203.
Hellenistic language, what, ii. 118.
Heracleon, an heretic of the second century; an account of him by Origen, i. 301. a more particular one of him and Theodotus, 312. mistaken in supposing Matthew and Levi not the same person, iii. 10.
Hermas, excluded by Eusebius from the canonical books, i. 63, n. St. Matthew cited in it, iii. 21.
Hermiani. Vide *Seleuciani*.
Hesychius, his false Gospels not extant, i. 108. though mentioned by Jerome and Gelasius as apocryphal, and only interpolations of ours, 203.
Hilscher, Mr. his relation of a Mahometan tradition, concerning Christ in his infancy, ii. 197, n.
Hobbes, his mistake in supposing that the Gospels, &c. were for a long time unknown to the generality of Christians, iii. 263.
Hooker, Mr. a citation out of him concerning assent to a proposition, i. 14.
Huetius, his confutation of the Jews, in their charge against Christ for using magical arts, i. 172, n. cites the Acts of Pilate, ii. 282, n.
Hypotyposes, account in them of St. Mark's Gospel, iii. 49.

I.

James, apocryphal piece of his not extant, i. 108. a book of his not the same (though thought so by Dr. Mill) with the Protevangelion, 205. other books attributed to him, 206. thought by Dr. Mill to be wrote by Leucius, 207, n.
Iconomachi, the author's conjecture concerning them, i. 220, n.
Jenkin, Dr. his account of Pilate's information and character of Christ,

ii. 281. his opinion concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, 363, n.
Jerome, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 30. his catalogue of canonical books, 55. quotation of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, 141, n. he places the Gospel of Matthias among spurious books, 225. his account of the Nazarene Gospel, 242. he mistakes concerning Ignatius's using the Nazarene Gospel, 257. affirms the Nazarene to be the same with the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, 262, n. reckons the Acts of Paul and Thecla apocryphal, 274, n. the Acts of Peter, &c. the like, 285, n. the Gospel of Peter the like, 289, n. the Judgment of Peter the like, 293, n. a fragment of his concerning the Preaching of Peter, 309. he reckons Peter's Acts, Gospels, and Revelation, apocryphal, 325, n. censures the Gospels of the Egyptians, and of Thomas, 347, n. seems to refer to the history of the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 6. his account of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, 42, n. he mentions the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, and gives a reason for placing the latter in his catalogue of saints, 54. translates the Gospel of the Birth of Mary out of Hebrew, at the request of Chromatius and Heliodorus, 69. their Epistle to him, and his answer concerning it, 81. another ascribed to him to the same purpose, 84. he entertained a veneration for relics, 218. cites the Acts of Pilate, 280, n. reckons the Acts of Paul and Thecla among the apocryphal scriptures, 326, n. his testimonies concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, 354. he says it was read among apocryphal books, 375, n. his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 8. his account of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel, 13. says St. Mark wrote his Gospel from St. Peter's information, 54. 162. his testimony concerning St. Luke's Gospel, 79. his account of St. John's design in writing his Gospel, 97. affirms the Acts of the Apostles to have been written by St. Luke, 110.
Jesus Christ, why he commanded secresy to the leper, iii. 200.
Jews, their haughty esteem of themselves, and contempt of all the world beside, i. 96. they charge our Saviour with using magical arts, 171.
Ignatius, his Epistle thought by some to be spurious, i. 259. cites St. Matthew, iii. 25. 265. St. Luke, 84. St. John, 103.
Innocent I. apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 32. his testimony of the forgeries of Leucius Charinus, 207. 213. 231. he rejects and condemns the books under the name of Matthias, or James the Less, 231, n. detects Leucius's forgeries under the name of Peter, 331, n.
John, the Acts of, and other apocryphal books under his name, not extant, i. 108. evidently appear to be the forgery of Leucius, 208. his approbation of the three former Gospels, recorded by Eusebius, iii. 1. 259. scripture accounts of him, 88. accounts of him from the fathers, 91. his death, 94. his design in writing his Gospel, 97. the time in which it was written, 99. his Gospel translated into Hebrew, 101. admired by the Platonists, ibid. its style, ibid. proved to be canonical, 102. in all the catalogues of sacred books, ibid. cited by the primitive Christians, ibid. read in their churches, 106. objections against it answered, 107. esteemed canonical by the Syrians, ibid.
Josephus, his testimony that the Jewish books were written on parchment, iii. 224.
Irenæus, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 27. his account of the Gospel of Judas Iscariot, 208. of the principles of Tatian, 540, n. mentions a forgery of the Gnosticks concerning our Saviour, 377. a grand mistake of his concerning the age of Christ, 380. his censure of the heretics for making use of the Gospels of the Infancy of Christ, ii. 194, n. he is the only ancient Christian who makes mention of them, ibid. shews that no more than the four Gospels which we now acknowledge were in his time acknowledged in the church, iii. 6. cites St. Matthew, 30. his notion of the time when St. Matthew's Gospel was published, 41. 261. his account of St. Mark's writing his Gospel, 54. 161. his testimony concerning St. Luke's, 79. cites St. Mark, 75. St. Luke, 85. St. John, 104. ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke, 109. cites them, 113. informs us that before his time there was a large number of spurious scriptures, 139.

Judas Iscariot, an apocryphal Gospel under his name not extant, i. 109. mentioned by Irenæus and Epiphanius, 208, n.
Jude, an apocryphal Gospel under his name not extant, i. 109.
Justin Martyr, his account of the weekly Christian meetings, i. 60, n. 87, n. he was a native of Palestine in Syria, 88. an objection, concerning his residence at Rome, answered, ibid. another of Dr. Cave's, that he was unacquainted with the Syriac language, answered, 89. in what sense he used the word Eucharist, 103. does not cite the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 259. appeals to the Acts of Pilate, ii. 279, n.

K.

King, lord chief justice, his collection of all the creeds within the three first centuries cited, ii. 15, n.
Kirstenius questioned the authority of the Revelation, i. 8.
Knatchbull, sir Norton, his opinion upon the text, Col. iv. 16. refuted, ii. 38.

L.

Lactantius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 28. his fragment of the Preaching of Peter, 308. his account of an objection the pagans used, that the verses of the sibyls were a forgery of the Christians, 318, n. cites the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, ii. 66, n. his account of St. Peter's being at Rome, iii. 63.
Laodicea, bishops of, their catalogue of canonical books, i. 55, n. they decree that no private psalms, or book without the canon, should be read in churches, 60.
Laud, archbishop, his judgment of the Epistle of Barnabas, ii. 357.
Le Clerc, his opinion concerning the time when St. Matthew wrote, iii. 42. supposes it incredible that St. Mark or St. Luke had seen St. Matthew's Gospel, 183.
L'Enfant, his opinion that St. Matthew wrote in Greek, iii. 252.
Leonides, a corrupt writing instead of Leucius, i. 221.
Leontius, Lenthon, Lentitius, Lucian, } All these denote only one spurious book, the forgery of Leucius Charinus, i. 114.
Leucius Charinus, his forgeries severely censured, i. 207, n. Leucius and Seleucus the same person, 212, n. Acts under his name the same as the Acts of Andrew and John, ibid. n. he was a Manichee, and lived in the latter end of the third, or beginning of the fourth century, 217. was a different person from Lucianus, ibid. the same with Seleucus, father of the Seleuciani, 218, n. his Acts spurious and apocryphal, 219. the judgment of Photius concerning them, ibid. Leucius and Leonides one and the same person, 222. he forged books under Peter's and other apostles' names, 331.
Lightfoot, Dr. his proof of the doxology, &c. i. 104, n. his conjecture concerning the text, 1 Cor. v. 9. rectified, 128. another conjecture of his different from the former, ibid. his conjecture concerning the words of Paul, Col. iv. 16. vol. ii. 40, n. exposition of the text, John xxi. 21. p. 370.
Linus, his Acts spurious, ii. 56. and rejected by several popish and protestant writers as such, ibid.
Locrinus esteemed the Acts of Paul and Thecla as genuine, ii. 330, n.
Lucian, his excellent directions for writing history, iii. 155.
Lucianus, a famous critic and martyr under Dioclesian and Maximian, i. 223. an interpolator of the Gospels, ibid. a different person from Lucianus, ibid.
Ludovicus Vives rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, ii. 68, n.
Luke, St. his Gospel formerly went under the name of St. Paul, i. 114, n. scripture accounts of him, iii. 72. accounts of him from the fathers, 74. not a Jew, 75. the opinion of Jerome and others, that he was more skilled in Greek than the other evangelists, ibid. a physician, ibid. one of the seventy disciples, 76. the companion of St. Paul, 77. his death, ibid. his relics said to have been carried to Constantinople, 78. his Gospel wrote from the information of the apostles, &c. ibid. under the direction of Paul, 79. his design in writing it, 80. the time in which it was written, 81. is canonical, 83. in all the catalogues of canonical books, ibid. cited by the early Christians, ibid. and several others, 87. read in the primitive churches, ibid. esteemed canonical by the churches of Syria, ibid. he wrote the Acts of the Apostles, 109. does not in the

beginning of chap. i. allude to either of the genuine Gospels, 138. verse 3. of chap. i. explained, 145.
Luther, his error in rejecting the Epistle of St. James, i. 8.

M.

Mahomet, in compiling his Alcoran, made great use of the Old and New Testaments, i. 402. does not cite either of our present Gospels, or any book of the New Testament by name, and the reason of it, 403. was furnished with spurious and apocryphal books of the New Testament, 404. could neither write nor read, ibid. his assistants in compiling the Alcoran, 405. he cites a history of the Virgin Mary and of Christ, 406. several passages in his Alcoran cited out of apocryphal books, ibid. reasons why he did not mention those books, 407.
Mahometans charge the Christians with having corrupted the Gospel of Christ, i. 410. espoused in it by the late Mr. Toland, ibid. n. four sayings or discourses ascribed to Christ by their doctors, 411. were well versed in the Gospel of Christ's Infancy, ii. 195, n. some of their traditions concerning this Gospel, 196, n.
Mangey, Dr. his charge of disingenuity and want of skill in Mr. Toland, i. 151. his conjecture concerning the original of the Gospel of Barnabas, 152, n. his opinion of the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 253, n. confutes Mr. Toland's endeavour to prove the Nazarenes the only true Christians, 315.
Manichæus Faustus rejected the New Testament, i. 7.
Manichees dispute the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, i. 7. pretend to produce an Epistle of Christ's, 108. Acts of the Apostles used by them not extant, 109. a spurious book, and the forgery of Leucius Charinus, 114. they esteemed the apocryphal Acts of Andrew above other Scriptures, and why, 136. their Acts the same with those of Leucius Charinus, 232. their agreement with the Mahometans and Montanists, 342. they alone among the ancients objected to the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, iii. 39. rejected the Acts of the Apostles, 118.
Marcion, what part of the New Testament he rejected, i. 7. his Gospel not extant, 109. no other than a copy of St. Luke's altered and interpolated, 233. he took away the two first chapters, ibid. is censured by Serapion, 288. he and his followers had a different Gospel of St. Luke, iii. 87.
Marcosians, a branch of the Gnosticks, ii. 194.
Mark, St. his Gospel no epitome of St. Matthew's, as Mr. Whiston would have it, i. 76, n. was formerly ascribed to Peter, 114, n. scripture account of, iii. 45. account of him from the fathers, 49. a companion or interpreter of St. Peter, 46, 49, 54. preached in Egypt, 49. one of the seventy disciples, 50. his death, 51. tradition of his relics being removed to Venice, 52. occasion of his writing his Gospel, ibid. wrote under the direction of St. Peter, 53. his Gospel went under the name of St. Peter, 58. 162. the language in which it was written, 59. the time of his writing, 61. his Gospel proved to be canonical, 64. in all the catalogues of canonical books, ibid. cited by the apostolic fathers, ibid. but no places cited from him which are not also in St. Matthew, ibid. and but one by Justin Martyr, 65. Irenæus cites him by name, and refers to places which are in no other Gospel, 66. Tertullian also cites that which is in no other Gospel, ibid. his Gospel read in the primitive churches, 68. was in the Syriac collection of sacred books, ibid. objections to it, 69. is not an abridgment of St. Matthew's, ibid. 159. the last chapter genuine, 70. instances in which he relates things more fully than St. Matthew, 167. several instances of his disagreeing with St. Matthew, 179. a catalogue of histories related by him which are not in St. Matthew, 184. things omitted in his Gospel which are in St. Matthew's, 185. his Gospel not an epitome, because inspired, 178. because the supposing it to be so detracts from its honour and usefulness, 188. and also greatly invalidates his testimony, 191. did not design in all things to observe the order of time, 196.
Marriage condemned by ancient heretics, i. 186, n.
Mary, the Gospel of her Birth, published out of Jerome, ii. 69. this Gospel extant in the third, and

even second century, and received by several ancient heretics as genuine, 109, n. it received many alterations, and the ancient copies were different from that of Jerome, 110. formerly went under the name of St. Matthew, &c. 111. is for the most part the same as the Protevangelion of James, 112. this Gospel contains several contradictions to the Evangelion, ibid. instances of them, ibid. several relations in both credited by ancient writers, 113. the Gospel and Protevangelion wrote by a Jew or Hellenist, 118. a conjecture that the Gospel was the later book, and made out of the Protevangelion, 123. but both are apocryphal, ibid. this Gospel rejected as such by Austin, ibid. and by Gelasius, 124. both of them are such, because neither was read in the Christian churches, and because they contain things contrary to known truths, 125. falsehoods in this Gospel detected, ibid. both books apocryphal from their fabulous contents, 129. a collection of trifling stories in this Gospel, 130. instances in it of accounts borrowed from canonical books, 132. this book apocryphal, because not in the Syriac version, 134. adoration, &c. when first offered to her, 214.

Matthew, books under his name not extant, i. 109. are censured for apocryphal, 206. 224. an account of him, iii. 9. occasion of his writing his Gospel, 12. his Gospel canonical, because it is in all the ancient catalogues, 13. cited by Barnabas, 15. 264. by Clemens Romanus, 17. 265. in the Shepherd of Hermas, 21. by Polycarp, 24. 265. by Ignatius, 25. 265. by the fathers next the apostolic age, 27. also in the Constitutions of the Apostles, 266. read as scripture in the primitive churches, 35. received by the churches of Syria, 37. used by Bartholomew in his preaching, ibid. written in Greek, 38, 40. 249. objected to by the Manichees, 38. its authority denied by the German anabaptists and Servetians, 40. the time of his writing his Gospel, ibid. 261. it was written before the rest, 43. branches of it, which Mr. Whiston supposes to be misplaced, 195. several of these in the proper order of time, 198. none of those branches, which are not according to the order of time, misplaced, 206. his Gospel not a translation from the Hebrew, 239. arguments to shew that he did not write in that language, 249.

Matthias, a spurious book forged under his name by the Nicolaitans, i. 11. his Gospel and traditions apocryphal, 109. 225. another book under his name not extant, 109. his Gospel censured by Origen, Eusebius, Ambrose, Jerome, and Gelasius, as spurious and apocryphal, 225. his traditions and fragments, 226, n. not written, but oral, ibid. other books under his name rejected and condemned, 231, n.

Mede, his exposition of John xxi. 21. ii. 370.

Menardus, Hugo, an account of him, and his sentiments concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, ii. 357.

Merinthus, his Gospel not extant, i. 109. the same with the Gospel of Cerinthus, 234.

Mill, Dr. affirms that St. Paul wrote several other Epistles than those extant, i. 124, n. his account of the Gospel of the Egyptians, 181. a mistake of his concerning a book of James, and the Protevangelion, 205, n. another concerning the age and person of Leucius rectified, 217. the cause of it, and an instance of his negligence in citations, 218. a remark of the author on his Greek Testament, ibid. his mistake in supposing Lucianus and Lucanus to be the same person, 223. another in supposing the Gospel of Matthias to be the same with the traditions, 225. his opinion about the original and interpolations of the traditions of Matthias, and mistake concerning Leucius, &c. 231. his sentiment of the Gospel of the Nazarenes, 252, n. an error of his concerning the Acts of Paul rectified, 276, n. his conjecture concerning the different titles of the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 281, n. opinion that the Judgment of Peter was the very same with the Revelation, refuted, 296. his sentiments of the Preaching of Peter, 311, n. account of the apocryphal Gospel of the Simonians, 336, n. observation on the Orthodoxographa, 340, n. his mistake concerning the Acts of Thomas, 345, n. he is censured for his various lections of the Gospels, 354, n.

falsely asserts the fathers of the first century to have promiscuously cited the apocryphal Gospels and inspired books, 357, n. mistakes a citation of Clemens to the same purpose, 361, 366. would persuade us that St. Paul directed the Epistle, entitled to the Ephesians, to the Laodiceans; and that the present title to the Ephesians is false, ii. 34, n. his opinion that these Epistles were the same, refuted, 39. his opinion concerning the original of the Gospel of Christ's Infancy, 220, n. of Barnabas's Epistle, 362, n. his error in supposing the first Christian writers to have cited no certain canon, iii. 14. in supposing that the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul alone belonged to the New Testament in the time of Chrysostom, 116.

Millennium, the doctrine of, its rise, i. 370.

Montanus and Montanists, their rise, i. 341. he is called by his followers the Paraclete, 342, n.

Monks derive their original from Egypt, i. 192.

Moses, the best and most accurate of historians, yet does not always observe the order of time, iii. 147.

N.

Nazarenes, Gospel of, several errors in it noted, i. 9. not extant, 109. the author's conjecture concerning St. Paul's reference to it, 22. the difference between them and the Jews, 23. seems to have been a different name of the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, 114. the most famous of all the ancient Gospels, 235. referred to by St. Paul, 236. fragments thereof, mostly collected by Dr. Grabe, 239. the various sentiments of later writers concerning this Gospel, 248. why so highly esteemed by many writers, 253. not cited by Papias, 255. no version of it till Jerome, 256. not cited by Ignatius, 257. nor referred to, as of authority, by Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, or Jerome, 260, n. this the same Gospel as that of the Twelve Apostles, 261. proved apocryphal in many instances, and for several reasons, 264. compiled out of St. Matthew's Greek, 268. why called that of the Twelve Apostles, 269. allowed to be an early composure, ibid. but full of fabulous stories, ibid. and made by convert Jews, 271. a brief account of the Nazarenes out of Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, ibid. n. this Gospel and the Ebionites the same, 272. they were always styled heretics by the catholic church, 314. notwithstanding which, Mr. Toland endeavours to prove them the only true Christians, 315, n.

Nessel, Daniel de, says there are five MSS. of the Protevangelion in the library of Vienna, ii. 135, n.

Nexocharis, or Xenocharis, a corrupt way of writing Charinus, the surname of Leucius, i. 221.

Nicodemus, Gospel of, taken out of the Orthodoxographa, ii. 223. was formerly called the Acts of Pilate, and why, 278. the name of Nicodemus was (according to Fabricius) given this Gospel by the Anglo-Saxons and Britons, &c. 279, n. probably some accounts of Christ, &c. were sent by Pilate to Tiberius, ibid. the Acts of Pilate appealed to by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, ibid. n. who affirm that he sent them to the emperor, 280. it does not appear that any Christian writer ever saw these Acts, 281, n. the original and occasion of these Acts, or Gospel, considered, 284. Leucius Charinus proved to be the author, 289. this Gospel, &c. proved apocryphal by several propositions, 292. miscellaneous remarks on it, 296.

Nicolaitans, their wicked design in forging a book under the name of Matthias, i. 11.

Nonnus makes no mention of the adulterous woman in St. John, i. 100, n. asserts that the first miracle Christ wrought was in Cana of Galilee, ii. 208, n.

Nye, Mr. his sentiments of the Gospel of the Nazarenes, i. 251, n.

O.

Ocobius de Castro cites a Gospel of Thomas, which Mr. Fabricius takes for the Gospel of the Infancy, &c. ii. 144, n.

Order of time, not intended to be observed by the Gospel writers, iii. 142 instances of its being violated by St. Luke, 143. not strictly observed by other historians, 146. violated by the writers of the Old Testament, 147. by profane historians, 150. why receded from by the evangelists, 151. because generally observed, it does not follow that it

should always be so, 155. observed in several parts of St. Matthew, which Mr. Whiston supposes to be misplaced, 198.
Origen, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 28. his catalogue of canonical books, 54. makes no mention of the adulterous woman in his Paraphrase on St. John, 100. his reason for reading apocryphal books, 117, n. he mentions the Gospel of the Egyptians, 178, n. his opinion of the Helkesaites, 201. was not the author of the Commentaries on Job, 224. ranks the Gospel of Matthias among other spurious pieces, 225, n. his account of the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 237. rejects it as apocryphal, 261. mentions the Acts of Paul, 275, n. cites the Gospel of Peter, 288, n. his account of Heracleon, 301. his fragments of the Preaching of Peter, 306. he mentions the Gospel of Thomas as heretical, 346, n. his testimonies concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, ii. 353. he did not esteem it as canonical scripture, 372. his testimony that the early church received only four Gospels, iii. 7. mistaken in supposing Matthew and Levi not the same person, 10. his account of St. Matthew's writing his Gospel, 12. says that St. Mark wrote by the direction of St. Peter, 54. 162. ascribes the Acts of the Apostles to St. Luke, 110.
Origenians esteemed the spurious Acts of Andrew above the scriptures, and why, i. 136.
Orthodoxographa, a fragment out of it concerning Christ's picture, which he sent to Abgarus, ii. 19. Vide *Harmony* and *Protevangelion*.
Osiander censures the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus for spurious, ii. 7, n.

P.

Pamelius, several ancient writers cited by him concerning the Christian meetings, i. 60. his remark on the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 283, n. his opinion concerning the Acts of Pilate, ii. 282, n.
Pantænus, found the Gospel of St. Matthew among the Indians, iii. 259.
Paper, first use of, iii. 220. not used by the Jews, 230.
Papers, separate, on which, according to Mr. Whiston, St. Matthew wrote, iii. 233.
Papias, a citation from him, proving there were several spurious writings in his time under the name of the apostles, i. 24. an instance of his too great fondness of traditions, 229. a character of him, 254, 366. his history of a woman accused before our Saviour of many crimes, ibid. two discourses ascribed by him to Christ, 368. he gave rise to the doctrine of the Millennium, ibid. which he seems to have borrowed from the Jews, 370. says St. Matthew's Gospel was in common use in his time, iii. 38. his account of St. Mark's, 53.
Pareus was of opinion that St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Corinthians before either of those now extant, i. 124, n.
Parker, Dr. confutes the Jews, in the charge they urge against our Saviour for using magical arts, i. 172. his sentiments concerning the letters of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 7, n. his opinion that Pilate transmitted an account of Christ, &c. to the emperor, 281, n.
Paul, several errors observed in the Gospel of his Preaching, i. 10. Paul and Thecla, their Acts, his Acts, his and Peter's Preaching, a book under his name, and his Revelation, not extant, 109. the last and the Anabaticon, one book, 114. a third Epistle of his, extant in an Armenian MS. to the Corinthians, 131. one from them to him, 130. plainly spurious, 133. the Acts of Paul and Thecla mentioned by Tertullian, Jerome, and Gelasius, as apocryphal, 274, n. Thecla's Acts published by Dr. Grabe, from a MS. in the Bodleian library, ibid. n. the author, with Dr. Grabe, thinks that this book is extant, 275. the Acts of Paul mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, and Philastrius, ibid. n. not the same book with the Acts of Paul and Thecla, 276. is apocryphal, 277. the Preaching of him and of Peter one book, ibid. another book forged by one Lucian, under the name of Paul the Martyr, ibid. n. Paul's Revelation cited by Epiphanius, Austin, and Gelasius, 278. the author supposes this and the Anabaticon to be one book, 279. proves that it is so, and apocryphal, 282. this book seems to be referred to as such, in a passage of Tertullian, ibid. n. the Revelation of his now extant in

Merton college, Oxon, a forgery, 284. his Epistle to the Laodiceans highly esteemed by several learned men, and its genuineness contended for by the Quakers, ii. 28, n. two MSS. of it produced by Sixtus Senensis, ibid. n. an Epistle under this title extant in Marcion's time, 33. Marcion's Apostolicon, ibid. St. Paul wrote no such Epistle, 35. the occasion of the forgery taken from Col. iv. 16. ibid. various opinions upon that text, 36. the present Epistle to the Laodiceans not the same that was in Marcion's Apostolicon, 41, n. is spurious and apocryphal, 42. stolen out of St. Paul's genuine Epistles, ibid. a conjecture concerning its original, 44. Paul's Epistles to Seneca, and Seneca's to Paul, 45. extant in the fourth century, 54. none of the fathers, besides Jerome and Austin, saw them, 55. a fragment out of Linus concerning them, ibid. the present are the same as the ancient Epistles, 57, n. they were not received as authentic by the two fathers above mentioned, 58. several evidences of their spuriousness, 60. the author's conjecture concerning the forgery of them, and the time of it, 66. a list of the writers, protestant and popish, who have rejected these Epistles as spurious, 68, n.

Paul and Thecla, the Acts of, published out of a MS. in the Bodleian library, ii. 299. several reasons for inserting these Acts, 325. they were ranked among the apocryphal scriptures by some primitive fathers, 326. several things contained in them were credited by the same fathers, 327, n. they went under St. Paul's name, 329. and were esteemed as genuine by several moderns, 330, n. were, in part, the forgery of a presbyter of Asia, mentioned by Tertullian, ibid. the present Acts different from the ancient book written by that presbyter, 331. are apocryphal and spurious, by the confession of their author, 332. because never mentioned in the catalogue of sacred books of the New Testament, 334. nor cited as such by any primitive fathers, ibid. because they contain many falsehoods, &c. 336. and idle and fabulous relations, 340. relate things later than the time in which they are said to be done, 342. the author's conjecture concerning the original and occasion of these Acts, 347.

Pearson, bishop, attempts to prove that the Decree of Gelasius concerning apocryphal books, is spurious, i. 140, n. corrects an error in monsieur Daillé concerning the time of the supposed Dionysius the Areopagite, 153, n. cites the Acts of Pilate, ii. 282, n.

Perfection, the Gospel of, not extant, i. 109. proved to be a spurious and apocryphal book, the forgery of the Gnosticks, 332, n. a conjecture concerning the design of it, ibid.

Peter, his Acts, Doctrine, Gospel, Judgment, Preaching, Revelation, and books under his name, not extant, i. 110. his Gospel proved to be spurious by Eusebius, Athanasius, &c. 214, n. his and Paul's Preaching one book, 114, 277, 297. his Acts, or Travels, written by Clemens, one book, and censured for apocryphal by the ancients, 285. his doctrine, 286. Gospel cited by Serapion, Tertullian, Origen, &c. 287. why Mark's Gospel was formerly called his, 289. it was not composed by Leucius, but forged by the Docetæ, 290. and likely the same as the Gospel of Basilides, 291. his book of Judgment accounted by Jerome apocryphal, 293, n. by Ruffin not canonical, but ecclesiastical, ibid. n. his Preaching very ancient, and cited by the fathers, &c. 297. the Epistle of Peter to James seems to be the forgery of some Ebionite, ibid. produced at length in Greek and English, 298. several fragments of his Preaching, 301. the concurrent opinions of late writers to elevate the authority of it, 309. refuted, and the piece proved apocryphal, 311. his Revelation cited by Clemens Alexandrinus, Theodosius, &c. 323. rejected by Eusebius as spurious, 328. and by the ancients, as Sozomen tells us, 330. supposed by Dr. Grabe and Dr. Mill to be a prophecy concerning the Jews and the state of the church till Antichrist, 331. other forgeries by Leucius under the name of Peter, ibid. things honourable to him, not mentioned by St. Mark, iii. 56. 162. at what time he was at Rome, 61.

Philastrius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 33. his catalogue of canonical books, 55. censure of the apocryphal Acts of Andrew, 134.

his charge against the Manichees, &c. for receiving the apocryphal, and rejecting the canonical books of the apostles, 215. he pronounces the Acts of Paul apocryphal, 376, n. his account of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, ii. 42, n.
Philip, his Acts and Gospel not extant in the writers of the first century, i. 333. pretended to be in the Vatican, ibid. n. his Gospel a forgery of the Gnosticks, and a fragment of it produced by Epiphanius, ibid. n. its abominable doctrines, 334, n. proved to be apocryphal, ibid.
Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, his just observation on the forgeries of Leucius, i. 207, n. 213. a further account of them by him, 219. his account of the Hypotyposes under Clemens's name, 325. his account of the Acts of Thecla, written in verse by Basil of Seleucia, ii. 329, n.
Pilate, Acts of. See *Nicodemus*.
Du Pin, his censure of the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 7, n. he rejects the Epistle of Paul and Seneca as spurious, 68, n. his sentiments of Barnabas's Epistle, 361, n.
Placæus, an absurdity of his concerning books canonical and apocryphal, i. 50.
Polycarp, his testimony concerning the four Gospels, iii. 2. cites St. Matthew, 24. 265. the Acts of the Apostles, 113.
Possevin rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, ii. 68, n.
Postellus and Bibliander, their account of the Protevangelion refuted, ii. 138.
Prayers for the dead, its antiquity and origin, ii. 343.
Prideaux, dean, observes it was the custom of Mahomet to flatter the Christians on all occasions, i. 407.
Procopius Cæsariensis, his relation of the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 6, n.
Protevangelion of James, published out of the Orthodoxographa of Jacobus Grynæus, ii. 86. is different from the ancient Gospel of Mary, &c. 113. was wrote by a Jew or Hellenist, 118. our author conjectures that this was the older book, and that the Birth of Mary was made out of it, 122. both are apocryphal, ibid. and proved so for several reasons, 125. instances of falsehoods in this book, ibid. both these books apocryphal from their fabulous contents, 129. a collection of trifling stories, 130. instances of things borrowed from canonical books, 131. several contradictions in it, 133. it is apocryphal because not in the Syriac version, 134. several MS. copies of it now extant in Europe, ibid. two in the French king's library, and five at Vienna, ibid. n. it was first made known in Europe by Postellus, and published by Bibliander, A. D. 1552. p. 135. rejected as spurious and apocryphal by most protestants and papists, 141.
Ptolemais, its ancient names among the Israelites, i. 93.
Publicans, their office explained, iii. 235.

Q.

Quakers contend for the genuineness of Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans, ii. 28, n.

R.

Relics, their original, ii. 218. much venerated by Austin, Jerome, Chrysostom, and others, ibid. a merry story from Chemnitius concerning them, 220, n.
Revelation, book of, why omitted in the public calendar for reading the scriptures, i. 53.
Richardson, Mr. his sentiments concerning the Nazarene Gospel, i. 252, n. detects a false assertion of Mr. Toland, concerning the Epistle of Barnabas, ii. 373, n.
Rivet, his censure of the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus, ii. 7, n. he rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, 68, n.
Ruffin, apocryphal book mentioned by him, i. 32. his catalogue of canonical books, 55. his account of the Judgment of Peter, 293, n.

S.

Salmeron, the Jesuit, contends for the genuineness of St. Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans, ii. 28, n.
Satanas, its derivation, i. 91.
Scaliger, his character and censure of Eusebius, ii. 16, n.
Schottus, A. a citation out of him concerning Seneca, ii. 65. he rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as spurious, 68, n.
Scythianus, the Gospel of, not extant, i. 110. mentioned by Cyril and Epiphanius, 335. he was founder of the Manichean sect, ibid.

Selden, Mr. in his Commentary on Eutychius, produces a prayer of our Lord, different from that in the Gospels, ii. 24. an account of it taken from the dean of Norwich's Life of Mahomet, &c. 27.
Seleucus, his Acts of the Apostles not extant, i. 110. he is the same with Leucius, 212, n. 218, 336.
Seleuciani (called also Hermiani) their tenets, &c. p. 218.
Seneca, his Epistles to Paul, ii. 45. extant in the fourth century, and cited by Jerome and Austin only, 54, n. he is ranked in the catalogue of saints by the former, ibid. applauded by Tertullian for his treatise of superstition, 66, n. cited by Lactantius, ibid. n. highly commended by Austin, ibid. n. a noble resolution of his, iii. 160. See *St. Paul.*
Serapion, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 27. his account of the Gospel of Peter, 287, n.
Sergius, a Nestorian, the principal assistant of Mahomet, in his Alcoran, i. 406.
Servetians, denied the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel, iii. 40.
Severus, what part of the New Testament he rejected, i. 7.
Severus Sulpitius makes mention of the Acts of Paul and Thecla, ii. 329, n.
Sibyls, an account of them, and their forged prophecies, i. 316.
Simon, Father, his defence of the antiquity of the Syriac version, i. 105, n. his sentiments of the Gospel of the Egyptians, 180, n. he condemns the Gospel of Eve for apocryphal, 200, n. his high opinion of the Nazarene, or Hebrew Gospel, 249, n. wrongfully charges Eusebius with self-contradiction, 329. condemns the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus for spurious, ii. 7, n. mentions two Greek MSS. of the Protevangelion in the French king's library, 134. his mistake in supposing the greatest part of the scriptures, now extant, to be mere abridgments, iii. 69. 189. in supposing that the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, were alone reckoned to belong to the New Testament in the time of Chrysostom, 116. his reason for thinking St. Mark's Gospel not an epitome of St. Matthew's, 186. one of the greatest enemies to the scriptures, 189. 217.
Simonians, so called from Simon Magus, their Gospel, i. 336.
Sixtus Senensis, his sentiments concerning the Gospel of the Egyptians, i. 179, n. his mistake concerning the traditions of Matthias, 229, n. opinion concerning the Nazarene or Hebrew Gospel, 249, n. his favourable opinion of the Preaching of Peter, 310. cites two MSS. of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans, ii. 28, n. attempts to prove the Epistle spurious, 43. his attempt to reconcile Irenæus and Eusebius, concerning the time when St. Matthew wrote, iii. 45. a peculiarity in St. John's style observed by him, 101.
Sozomen, his fabulous account of the Revelation of Paul, i. 282. says Peter's Revelation was read yearly in some churches of Palestine, 330, n. but was rejected by the ancients as spurious, ibid.
Spanheim, Mr. an observation of his concerning Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, i. 4. an error of his concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 279, n.
Spanheim, the younger, proves the story and Epistles of Christ and Abgarus to be spurious, ii. 7, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, 68, n. a citation out of him concerning the worship of the Virgin Mary, &c. 215, n. his opinion of the Acts of Pilate, 282, n. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, 301, n.
Spinoza, one of the greatest enemies to the scriptures, iii. 189. 217. asserted, that most of the books of the Old Testament were abridgments of larger records, 189.
Stapleton, the Jesuit, contends for the genuineness of St. Paul's Epistle to the Laodiceans, ii. 28, n.
Stephen, the Revelation of, not extant, i. 110. declared apocryphal by Gelasius, 337.
Styles of authors various, with a dissertation upon them, i. 69.
Suetonius, frequently violates the order of time, iii. 150.
Syriac Version, i. 77. an historical account of it, ibid. when first known among the Europeans, 78. the judgments of learned men about it, 79. an attempt to prove this version was made in the apostles' times, 80. this language is sometimes called Chaldee, sometimes Syriac, sometimes

Syro-Chaldaic; but most commonly by the writers of the New Testament, and first Christians, Hebrew, 82. it was the language of Syria and Mesopotamia, and of Jerusalem and Galilee in our Saviour's time, 83. Syriac and Chaldee are by the prophet Daniel synonymous languages, 85. this version has not the history of the adulterous woman mentioned in St. John, 100, n. nor the famous controverted text, 1 John v. 7. ibid. nor has the old version the four catholic Epistles, nor the Revelation, 101. this version was thought by Tremellius and bishop Walton to be made in the apostles' time, ibid. n. the antiquity of it confirms the purity of the printed copies of the New Testament, 106. is of great use in explaining many passages, ibid. the controverted text, 1 Cor. v. 9. paraphrased by the old Syriac translator, 127.

Syriac version of St. Matthew, in the same order as our present Greek copies, iii. 260. 268. made in the time of the apostles, ibid. Syriac then the language of the Jews, ibid. that which we now have is the ancient version, 273.

Syrians were the first idolaters mentioned in scripture, i. 98, n. among the Jews, that appellation denoted profane persons, ibid.

T.

Tatian, the Gospel of, not extant, i. 111. mentioned by Eusebius and Epiphanius, 338, n. was a Harmony of the four Gospels, ibid. seems to be taken from the Hebrew Gospel, 339. an account of him and his principles, ibid. his Harmony of the four Gospels, iii. 4. 135.

Terebinthus, afterwards called Manes, (the father of the Manichees,) styled himself the Paraclete, i. 342.

Tertullian, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 27. his account of the Christian meetings, 60, n. interpretation of 1 Tim. iv. 3. vol. i. 187. account of Marcion's Gospel, 233, n. he cites the Acts of Paul and Thecla, 273, n. says the Gospel of Mark is affirmed by some to be that of Peter, 288, n. differs, in his account of Marcion's Apostolicon, from Epiphanius, ii. 34, n. and is in this mistaken, ibid. he applauds Seneca for his treatise on superstition, 66, n. appeals to, and often cites, the Acts of Pontius Pilate, 279. is the first that mentions the practice of signing with the cross, 295. ranks the Acts of Paul and Thecla among apocryphal scriptures, 326, n. and declares it the forgery of an Asiatic presbyter, ibid. has expressly determined the number of Gospels in his time to be four, iii. 7. says the Gospel of St. Mark went under the name of St. Peter, 58. cites St. Mark, 66. his testimony concerning St. Luke's Gospel, 79. he ascribes to St. Luke the Acts of the Apostles, 110. cites them, 115.

Tessarescaidecatites, why so called, ii. 278. their rise about the latter end of the third century, 285.

Testament, books of the Old, always preserved by Providence safe and uncorrupted, iii. 256.

Thaddæus, the Gospel of, not extant, i. 111. declared apocryphal by Gelasius, 340, n.

Thecla, martyrdom of, how and by whom first published, i. 27. Vide *Paul.*

Themison, his catholic Epistle not extant, i. 111. mentioned by Apollonius, 341. he was a Montanist, ibid.

Theodotus Byzantius, apocryphal books mentioned by him, i. 27. his fragment of the Preaching of Peter, 303. a particular account of him and his heresies, 312. he cites the Revelation of Peter, 323, n.

Theophilus Antiochenus, his references to St. Matthew, iii. 30. to St. John, 104.

Theophylact, makes no mention of the adulterous woman in John viii. vol. i. 100, n. his opinion concerning the Epistles to the Laodiceans and Ephesians, refuted, ii. 40. he asserts that Christ wrought no miracles in his infancy, 208, n.

Therapeutæ, an account of them from Mr. Whiston, i. 181.

Thomas, the Acts, &c. under his name not extant, i. 111. mentioned by Epiphanius, Athanasius, and Gelasius, 344, n. not the same with those of Leucius Charinus, 345. a MS. of it said by Father Simon to be in the French king's library, and another by Dr. Grabe in our Bodleian, ibid. his Gospel mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, Cyril, Ambrose, Athanasius, Jerome, and Gelasius, 346, n. there were two Gospels under his

name, 347. his Revelation only mentioned, and declared apocryphal by Gelasius, 348. other books under his name condemned by Innocent I. ibid.
Timothy, the Martyrdom of, an extract from it in Photius, iii. 2.
Tobit, Book of, guilty of a direct falsity, i. 9.
Toinard, his Harmony cited, iii. 217.
Toland, Mr. his pretended catalogue of canonical books not complete, i. 3. his false opinion concerning the depository of the books of the present canon till Adrian's time, 38, n. he endeavours to confirm a conjecture of Dr. Grabe concerning a fragment of Barnabas's Gospel, 145. his account of an Italian MS. he had seen of it, ibid. a notorious false inference of his detected by Dr. Mangey, 150, n. a malicious mistake of his concerning the books reported to be written by our Saviour, 167. an instance of his inaccuracy in quotations, 173, n. his disingenuity in citing, as genuine, a forgery of the Ebionites, 195, n. folly in placing among canonical books the Gospel of Eve, 201, n. as also that of Judas Iscariot, 209, n. a mistake of his in esteeming the traditions of Matthias as a written book, 229, n. his sentiments of the Hebrew or Nazarene Gospel, 250. his extravagant positiveness and unpardonable mistakes, 209, n. another concerning Hegesippus, 260, n. another very notorious in relation to Origen, 261, n. his unpardonable falsehood in asserting that the fathers appealed to the Nazarene as a true Gospel, 263. the author's just rebuke and admonition to him, ibid. an instance of a notorious imposture of his, 264, n. his false citations of St. Austin and Epiphanius detected, 274, n. an ignorant blunder of his concerning the Anabaticon and Revelation of Paul, 280, n. his endeavour to prove that the Nazarenes were the only true Christians, 315. answered by Dr. Mangey, ibid. his fond opinion of the Preaching of Peter, 310, n. he esteems Peter's Revelation as valuable as several books of the present canon, ibid. n. he injuriously charges Eusebius with a mistake, 329. refers to a citation out of Sozomen, to prove Peter's Revelation not spurious, 330, n. supposes that Revelation to be a prophecy concerning the Jews, and the state of the Christian church, 331, n. his ignorance and malice in his distinction between *Paraclete* and *Periclyte* detected, 343. he supports the charge of the Mahometans against the Christians, of having corrupted the Gospel of Christ, 410. a notorious blunder of his, in citing Austin concerning the Epistles of Paul and Seneca, ii. 58, n. his opinion concerning Barnabas's Epistle, 361, n. he falsely asserts that Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen cited the aforementioned Epistle as scripture, 373, n. his opinion that the first Christian writers had no certain canon, which they cited, iii. 14. thought that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke should be of no greater authority than the works of the apostolic fathers, 70. his mistake in supposing that the Gospels lay a long time concealed, 263. and that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were the same persons, 241.
Tradition, certainly the best method to prove the truth of the sacred books, i. 49. an objection to it answered, 52.
Tremellius thought the Syriac version to be made in the apostles' times, i. 101, n.
Truth, the Gospel of, not extant, i. 111. condemned by Irenæus, 348, n. a forgery of the Valentinians, 349.

U.

Valentinus, Gospel of, not extant, i. 111. different from the Gospel of Truth, 352.
Valesius, wrongfully charges Eusebius with self-contradiction, i. 329, n. his opinion of the Harmony of the Orthodoxographa, 340. his opinion concerning the Acts of Pilate, ii. 282, n.
Vossius, a mistake of his concerning the language spoken in Jerusalem, in our Saviour's time, rectified, i. 85. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 358, n.
Usher, archbishop, proves Ignatius's Epistle to be corrupted and interpolated, i. 259, n. his sentiments of a saying of Christ in the Epistle of Barnabas, 357. his sentiments of Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 356.

W.

Walther demonstrates the Epistles of Christ and Abgarus to be spurious, ii. 7, n. rejects the Epistles of Paul and Seneca as such, 68, n. cites the Acts of Pilate, 282.

Walton, bishop, thought the Syriac translation of the New Testament to be made in the apostles' time, i. 101.

Wells, an opinion of his censured, iii. 213.

Whiston, Mr. a citation from him concerning the Constitutions of the Apostles, i. 6. his error concerning St. Mark's Gospel, 76, n. his sentiments of the Gospel of the Egyptians, and account of the Therapeutæ mentioned by Philo, 181, n. he wrongfully supposes the Egyptian Gospel, and Traditions of Matthias, to be used among them, 182, n. would have the Preaching of Peter canonical, 311, n. recommends Peter's Revelation as a sacred book, 325. his mistake concerning a saying of Christ, cited by most of the fathers, 386. his opinion of Barnabas's Epistle, ii. 363, n. his many curious and useful discoveries in his Harmony, iii. 136. mistaken in supposing that the former part of St. Matthew's Gospel is misplaced, ibid. his opinion that the evangelists intended to observe always the order of time, confuted, 142. he supposes St. Luke's Gospel to be perfectly in the order of time, 143. furnishes the author with a reason why the evangelists differ, 154. his argument, that, because St. Matthew for the most part writes in this order, he never recedes from it, 155. also, that the notes of time, &c. are as many in that part which is now misplaced, as in that which is in its proper order, 156. he supposed St. Mark's Gospel to be an epitome of St. Matthew's, 158. his own epitome of the Gospel history, 186. the argument he derives from the last-mentioned supposition, 193. the branches of St. Matthew's Gospel which he thought misplaced, 195. he accounts for this disorder, by supposing that St. Matthew wrote on small pieces of paper, 216. his observation that the present Gospel of St. Matthew is a translation from the Hebrew, 238. he supposes the disorder to end, and the true order to begin, at the death of John the Baptist, 255.

Whitby, Dr. his Examen of Dr. Mill's Various Lections, &c. i. 105, n. 354. his interpretation of 1 Cor. v. 9. rectified, 128. his remark on 1 Tim. iv. 3. p. 190, n. opinion of the Hebrew or Nazarene Gospel, 252, n. his mistake concerning the woman of Samaria, 367. believes the present Epistle to the Ephesians was formerly entitled to the Laodiceans, ii. 34, n. his opinion, that the Epistle to the Laodiceans and Ephesians was the same, refuted, 37. his exposition of John xxi. 21. p. 370. his explanation of the word καθεξῆς in St. Luke, iii. 146. he has considered the testimony of the fathers, concerning St. Matthew's Gospel having been first written in Hebrew, 239. shews that they were often mistaken, ibid.

Wilkins, Mr. an oversight of his in the dedication of his translation of the third Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, and Paul's Epistle to them, i. 132.

Wisdom of Solomon, book of, a gross error in it, i. 9.

Writing, manner of, among the ancients, iii. 219. among the Jews, Greeks, and Romans, before and in our Saviour's time, 221.

X.

Xenocharis, a corrupt way of writing Charinus, i. 222.

March, 1856.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY

JOHN HENRY AND JAMES PARKER,

OXFORD; AND 377, STRAND, LONDON.

REV. P. FREEMAN.

THE PRINCIPLES OF DIVINE SERVICE. An Inquiry concerning the true manner of understanding and using the order for Morning and Evening Prayer, and for the Administration of the Holy Communion in the English Church. By the Rev. PHILIP FREEMAN, formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge; late Principal of the Theological College, Chichester. 8vo., cloth, 10*s*. 6*d*.

REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE, as contained in the Fathers, from the death of St. John the Evangelist to the Fourth General Council, vindicated in Notes on a Sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," preached, A.D. 1853, before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew; Canon of Christ Church; late Fellow of Oriel College. 8vo., cloth, 12*s*.

REV. E. MONRO.

DAILY STUDIES DURING LENT. By the Rev. EDWARD MONRO, Incumbent of Harrow Weald, Middlesex; Author of "Parochial Work," "The Parish," "The Combatants," &c. Fcap. 8vo., antique cloth, 6*s*.

REV. W. KAY, D.D.

THE PROMISES OF CHRISTIANITY. An Essay, by W. KAY, D.D., Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford. 8vo., cloth, 4*s*.

ABP. LAUD.

THE PRIVATE DEVOTIONS of Dr. WILLIAM LAUD, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Martyr. A new and revised Edition, with Translations to the Latin Prayers, handsomely printed with vignettes and red lines. Fcap. 8vo., antique cloth, 5*s*.

REV. N. SPINCKES.

SPINCKES' DEVOTIONS. The True Church-of-England-man's Companion in the Closet. With a Preface by NATHANIEL SPINCKES, M.A. A new Edition, with handsome floriated borders, fcap. 8vo., antique cloth, 4*s*.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE, as set forth in the Works of Divines and others in the English Church since the Reformation. Part II. 8vo., 4*s*.

The two Parts complete, bound in one volume, cloth, 9*s*.

BP. BULL.

The Judgment of the Catholic Church on the necessity of believing that our Lord Jesus Christ is very God; the Primitive and Apostolic Tradition of the Doctrine concerning the Divinity of our Saviour Jesus Christ; Brief Animadversions on a Treatise of Mr. Gilbert Clerke. By GEORGE BULL, D.D. Vol. III. 8vo., cloth, 10*s*.

Forming Vol. LXXVII. of the "Anglo-Catholic Library."

BP. COSIN.

NOTES AND COLLECTIONS ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By JOHN COSIN, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham. Vol. V. Cloth, 12*s*.

Forming Vol. LXXVIII. of the "Anglo-Catholic Library."

S. CHRYSOSTOM.

S. JOANNIS CHRYSOSTOMI HOMILIÆ in Epistolas Paulinas. Tom. V., continens Homilias in Epistolas ad Philippenses, Colossenses et Thessalonicenses. 8vo., cloth, 14*s*. To Subscribers, 10*s*. 6*d*.

Forming Vol. X. of the "Bibliotheca Patrum."

DR. BURTON.

THE GREEK TESTAMENT, with English Notes. By the Rev. EDWARD BURTON, D.D., sometime Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity. Fifth Edition, revised, with a new Index. 8vo., 10*s*. 6*d*.

REV. J. DAVISON.

DISCOURSES ON PROPHECY, in which are considered its Structure, Use, and Inspiration; being the substance of Twelve Sermons preached in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn, by JOHN DAVISON, B.D. Sixth and cheaper Edition, 8vo., cloth, 9*s*.

PLAIN COMMENTARY.

A PLAIN COMMENTARY ON THE FOUR HOLY GOSPELS, intended chiefly for Devotional Reading. The set, with Illustrations, 7 vols., cloth, 1*l*. 8*s*. 6*d*.; strongly bound, 2*l*. 2*s*.

ST. MATTHEW. 2 vols., 7*s*.	ST. LUKE. 2 vols., 7*s*.
ST. MARK. 4*s*. 6*d*.	ST. JOHN. 2 vols., 10*s*.

"The Commentary is said to be intended for devotional reading, and certainly ought not to be approached in a controversial or even critical spirit. We will say only that the portion before us, including the Commentary on St. Matthew, fulfils the promise of the title-page, in being plain and fit for readers of all classes. The learning, which is great, is everywhere subordinated to real illustration and enforcing of the sacred text."—*Guardian*, Feb. 15, 1854.

"The Plain Commentary on the Four Holy Gospels is now carried on in the two additional volumes before us to the end of the Gospel of St. Luke. We desire to repeat and enforce, if possible, our expressions as to the beauty and value of this book, the simplicity of which is almost as remarkable as its depth and learning."—*Guardian*, Aug. 23, 1854.

SERMONS.

PLAIN SERMONS ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By a Writer in the "Tracts for the Christian Seasons." Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5*s*.

SHORT SERMONS FOR FAMILY READING. Ninety Short Sermons for Family Reading, following the course of the Christian Seasons. By the Author of a "Plain Commentary on the Gospels."

Now complete, in 2 volumes, cloth, 8*s*.

ALL FAITH THE GIFT OF GOD.—REAL FAITH ENTIRE. Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, on the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Sundays after Trinity, 1855. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. 8vo., 2*s*.

BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1855. The Absence of Precision in the Formularies of the Church of England, Scriptural, and suitable to a state of Probation. In Eight Sermons preached at Bampton's Lecture, 1855. By JOHN ERNEST BODE, M.A., Rector of Westwell, and late Student of Christ Church, Oxford. 8vo., 8*s*.

SERMONS ON THE LORD'S DAY, and some prominent points of Christian Doctrine and Practice. By G. S. GOWRING, M.A. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 5*s*.

SINGLE SERMONS.

BISHOP OF OXFORD'S Sermon before the University, *Rome—her new Dogma and our Duties*. 8vo., sewed, 1*s*.

BISHOP OF OXFORD'S Sermon on *The English Reformation*, preached before the University, Nov. 5, 1855. 8vo., 1*s*.

BISHOP OF OXFORD'S Sermon, *Our Reception of the Truth of Christ's Message a Part of our Moral Probation*, preached before the University of Oxford, on the Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 9, 1856. 8vo., 1*s*.

PROFESSOR HEURTLEY'S Sermon on *The Lord's Day*, preached before the University, Nov. 4, 1855. 8vo., 1*s*.

PROFESSOR HEURTLEY'S Sermon on *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, preached before the University, Jan. 27, 1856. 8vo., 1*s*.

PROFESSOR HUSSEY'S Sermon on *The Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ*, preached at the Ordination held by the Bp. of Oxford, Dec. 23, 1855. 8vo., 1*s*.

DR. GOULBURN'S Sermon on *The Goodness and Severity of God as manifested in the Atonement*, preached before the University of Oxford, Feb. 10, 1856. 8vo. 1*s*.

TWO SERMONS preached before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. T. D. BERNARD, M.A., of Exeter College. 8vo., 1*s*. 6*d*.

The Rev. C. BARING'S Sermon, *Christ's Death a Propitiatory Sacrifice*, preached before the University of Oxford, on the Second Sunday in Lent, Feb. 17, 1856. 8vo., 1*s*.

The Rev. F. MEYRICK'S Sermon, *God's Revelation and Man's Moral Sense considered in reference to the Sacrifice of the Cross*, preached before the University of Oxford, on the Fifth Sunday in Lent, March 9, 1856. 8vo., 1*s*.

THE TWO HOMES. A Tale. By the Author of "Amy Grant." Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. For the use of Children in the English Church. Edited by the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

EPITAPHS FOR COUNTRY CHURCHYARDS. Collected and arranged by AUGUSTUS J. C. HARE, of University College, Oxford. Fcap. 8vo., 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE OLD WEEK'S PREPARATION towards a worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, after the warning in the Church for its celebration. Edited by WILLIAM FRASER, B.C.L., Curate of Alton. 16mo., cloth, 2*s.*

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, from the First Century to the Reformation. By J. S. BARTLETT. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.*

PAROCHIAL PAPERS. VOL. II. Edited by the Rev. JOHN ARMITSTEAD, Vicar of Sandbach, Cheshire. Containing Lectures on Secular subjects. The Fabric of the Church.—Parochial Charities.—The Congregation: its Duties.—The Sacrament of Baptism.—Confirmation. 8vo., cloth, 7*s.*

THE CHRONICLES OF CAMBER CASTLE. A Tale of the Reformation. Fcap. 8vo., with Illustrations, cloth, 3*s.*

KENNETH; OR, THE REAR-GUARD OF THE GRAND ARMY. By the Author of the "Heir of Redclyffe," "Heartsease," &c., &c. Fcap. 8vo., with Illustrations, 5*s.*

THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Thoughts in Verse for the Sundays and Holydays throughout the Year. Forty-seventh Edition. Fcap. 8vo., cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

A CATALOGUE OF OLD AND SECOND-HAND BOOKS, offered for Sale at Reduced Prices, by John Henry and James Parker, Oxford. (8vo., 148 pp.)

THE CHURCH CALENDAR AND DIARY. Parker's Church Calendar, bound with a Diary, printed in red and black, containing space for memoranda for every day throughout the year. Fcap. 8vo., roan, 2*s.* 6*d.*

THE CHURCHMAN'S YEAR-BOOK. The Churchman's Year-Book for 1856; or, The Ecclesiastical Annual Register: being a Record of Facts and Proceedings in connection with the Church of England during the year 1855. 8vo., cloth, 6*s.*

SHOREHAM CALENDAR. The Calendar of the College of S. Nicolas, Shoreham, for the year of our Lord 1856. 16mo., 1*s.*

The Literary Churchman.

A RECORD OF RELIGIOUS LITERATURE.

THE LITERARY CHURCHMAN was established in order to extend to RELIGIOUS LITERATURE the advantages which General Literature already possessed in the *Athenæum*, *Literary Gazette*, *Critic*, and other similar journals.

It is the object of this Journal to place the subscriber entirely *au courant* with the Religious Literature of the day, by reviewing and noticing all religious works, of whatever class or kind, as they are issued from the press.

The usual contents of the Journal are as follows:—

A SUMMARY OF CHURCH EVENTS, and short Articles on the Religious Topics of the day.

REVIEWS and NOTICES of all the new Religious Publications,—as far as possible explaining their nature and object, with Extracts and criticism, &c., when needed.

FOREIGN BOOKS, Short Notices of, with lists of all new Religious Works as published in France, Germany, and America.

A COMPLETE LIST of English Books in General Literature published during the fortnight, arranged according to subjects, with size, price, &c.

Index, with prices of books noticed,—Literary Notes and Queries, &c., &c.

In preparation.

A Series of Articles on Parochial Literature, with Retrospective Reviews and Notices of the different Books, Tracts, &c., published on the various subjects connected with the management of a Parish.

Published every alternate Saturday, price 4d.; Free by Post, 5d.

SUBSCRIPTIONS.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
For the year 1856, 26 Numbers	8	0	For Six Months, 12 Numbers .	4	0
„ Ditto free by Post .	10	0	„ Ditto free by Post .	5	0

A Specimen Number sent gratuitously on application.

Published at the Office, 377, Strand, London.

Archaeological, &c.

ANCIENT ARMOUR AND WEAPONS of Europe, from the Iron Period of the Northern Nations to the end of the Thirteenth Century; with Illustrations from cotemporary monuments. By JOHN HEWITT, Member of the Archæological Institute of Great Britain. 8vo., cloth, gilt top, 18*s.*

SUFFOLK CHURCHES. Ecclesiastical and Architectural Topography of England, Part VII. Suffolk:—containing an Architectural account of every Church in the County, with notices of objects of interest, &c., &c. 8vo., cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

ALTERTHUMLICHES WARTREGISTER DER BAUKUNST. Deutsch-English, English-Deutsch. A Vocabulary of Architecture, English-German, and German-English, with references to the 1700 specimens engraved in the Glossary of Architecture. With an Introduction translated and condensed from "Der Vorschule Zur Geschichte der Kirchenbaukunst," von Wilhelm Lübke. 8vo., sewed, 2*s.*

Also the French-English and English-French Vocabulary. 8vo., sewed, 2*s.*

MANUALS OF GOTHIC ORNAMENT.

No. 1. GOTHIC STONE CARVING, with numerous Illustrations. 16mo., sq., 1*s.* 6*d.*

No. 2. GOTHIC MOULDINGS, with numerous Illustrations. 16mo., 1*s.* 6*d.*

No. 3. GOTHIC SURFACE ORNAMENT. *Just ready.*

PAROCHIAL.

PSALMODY FOR THE CHRISTIAN SEASONS. Selected from the "Cleveland Psalter." 18mo., limp, 1*s.*

HYMN-BOOK. A Hymn-Book for the Services of the Church, and for Private Reading. 18mo., cloth, 1*s.*; limp, 9*d.*

THE DUTY OF PREPARING OURSELVES TO RECEIVE THE LORD'S SUPPER. A Pastor's Address to his Parishioners. By the Rev. T. L. CLAUGHTON, M.A., Vicar of Kidderminster. Fcap. 8vo., 1*d.*

HOLY MATRIMONY. Devotional Exercises suggested by the Service in the Book of Common Prayer, for the use of those who intend to enter into that Holy Estate. By ROBERT HAKE, Senior Canon of Canterbury Cathedral. Fcap. 8vo., sewed, 2*d.*

PRAYERS FOR MORNING AND EVENING, compiled by the Rev. C. MARRIOTT, B.D., Fellow of Oriel College, and Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin in Oxford. 16mo., cloth, 1*s.* 6*d.*

A SHORT MANUAL OF DEVOTIONS for every day in the Week. 16mo., 6*d.*

PRAYERS FOR THE USE OF SCHOOL TEACHERS. 16mo., sewed, 2*d.*

PRAYERS for the Children of the Church. 16mo., 1*d.*

NATIONAL DAILY PRAYER one Source of National Strength and Defence. Consisting of Extracts from the ordinary Services of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, specially adapted to our present time of Trial. Sewed, 2*d.*

A PARTING GIFT to Young Women leaving School and entering Service. By the Author of "Charlie Burton," "Broken Arm," &c. Fcap. 8vo., sewed, 4*d.*

LITTLE FOOTPRINTS ON THE OLD CHURCH PATH. A Memoir of a Christian Child. Third Edition. 18mo., 8*d.*

SELENE; THE QUEEN OF THE ROSY CROSS. A Christian Fairy Tale. An attempt to bring Children's favourite fairy lore into the service of the Blessed Sign with which they were sealed at their baptism. 16mo., with illustration, 4*d.*

TALES FOR THE YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN OF ENGLAND.

"To make boys learn to read, and then to place no good books within their reach, is to give them an appetite, and leave nothing in the pantry save unwholesome and poisonous food, which, depend upon it, they will eat rather than starve."—*Sir W. Scott.*

Now ready, price 1*s. each.*

No. 1. Mother and Son.
No. 2. The Recruit. *A new Edition.*
No. 3. The Strike.
No. 4. James Bright, the Shopman.
No. 5. Jonas Clint.
No. 6. The Sisters.
No. 7. Caroline Elton; or, Vanity and Jealousy. } 1*s.*
No. 8. Servants' Influence. }
No. 9. The Railway Accident.
No. 10. Wanted, a Wife.
No. 11. Irrevocable.
No. 12. The Tenants at Tinkers' End.
No. 13. Windycote Hall.
No. 14. False Honour.
No. 15. Old Jarvis's Will.
No. 16. The Two Cottages.
No. 17. Squitch.

EDUCATIONAL.

THE ETHICS OF ARISTOTLE. With Notes by the Rev. W. E. JELF, B.D., Author of "A Greek Grammar," &c. 8vo., cloth, 12*s.*

The Text separately, 5*s.* The Notes separately, 7*s.* 6*d.*

Just published. Third Edition, cloth, 12*s.*

MADVIG'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Latin Grammar for the Use of Schools. By Professor MADVIG, with additions by the Author. Translated by the Rev. G. F. WOODS, M.A. 8vo., uniform with JELF'S "Greek Grammar."

Competent authorities pronounce this work to be the very best Latin Grammar yet published in England. This new Edition contains an Index to the Authors quoted.

A MANUAL OF GREEK AND LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION, specially designed to illustrate the differences of Idiom between those Languages and the English. By E. R. HUMPHREYS, LL.D., Head Master of Cheltenham Grammar-School. Crown 8vo., cloth, 3*s.* 6*d.*

THE ANNALS OF ENGLAND; an Epitome of English History, from Cotemporary Writers, the Rolls of Parliament, and other Public Records. Vol. I., fcap. 8vo., with Illustrations, cloth, 5*s.*

The Second Volume, price 5s., is just ready.

THE CLASSICS, WITH SHORT NOTES.

(Recently published.)

EURIPIDES—*Alcestis.* 1*s.*
———— *Hippolytus.* 1*s.*
———— *Phœnissæ.* 1*s.*

SOPHOCLES—*Philoctetes.* 1*s.*
———— *Antigone.* 1*s.*
———— *Trachiniæ.* 1*s.*

ÆSCHINES *in Ctesiphontem.* 2*s.*

SALLUST—*Catiline.* 1*s.*
———— *Jugurtha.* 1*s.* 6*d.*

HORACE—*Odes and Epodes.* 2*s.*
———— *Satires.* 1*s.*
———— *Epist. et Ars Poetica.* 1*s.*

CORNELIUS NEPOS. 1*s.* 6*d.*

SHORT NOTES to the Six Plays of EURIPIDES. 16mo., in one vol., cloth, 3*s.*

—— The Text, ditto, 3*s.* 6*d.*

SHORT NOTES to the Seven Plays of SOPHOCLES. Cloth, 3*s.*

—— The Text, ditto, 3*s.* 6*d.*

SHORT NOTES to HORACE. Cloth, 2*s.*

—— The Text, ditto, 2*s.*

N.B.—A Catalogue, containing a complete list of the Classics, with Short Notes, and other publications, may be had free by post on receipt of a Penny Stamp.

Books printed at the University Press, Oxford;

AND SOLD BY

JOHN HENRY PARKER, Oxford, and 377, Strand, London;

and E. GARDNER, 7, Paternoster-row, London.

INETT'S CHURCH HISTORY. Origines Anglicanæ; or, A History of the English Church from the Conversion of the English Saxons till the Death of King John. By JOHN INETT, D.D., Precentor, and Canon Residentiary of Lincoln. A new Edition, by the Rev. JOHN GRIFFITHS, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Wadham College. 3 vols. 8vo., cloth, 1*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

BINGHAM'S WORKS. The Works of the Rev. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A., edited by his lineal descendant, the Rev. R. BINGHAM, Jun., M.A., formerly of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and for many years Curate of Trinity Church, Gosport. A new Edition, in 10 volumes. 8vo., cloth, 5*l.* 5*s.*

HOOPER'S WORKS. The Works of the Right Rev. GEORGE HOOPER, D.D., sometime Bishop of Bath and Wells. A new Edition, in two volumes. 8vo., cloth, 16*s.*

SACRED CHRONOLOGY. By the late GODFREY FAUSSETT, D.D., Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Edited by ROBERT FAUSSETT, M.A. 8vo., cloth, 7*s.* 6*d.*

RHEMES AND DOWAY. An Attempt to shew what has been done by Roman Catholics for the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures in English. By the Rev. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L., Archdeacon of Cashel, &c. 8vo., cloth, 9s.

THE CLERGYMAN'S INSTRUCTOR. Or a Collection of Tracts on the Ministerial Duties. Sixth Edition. 8vo., cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

NOVUM ORGANUM. Francisci Baconi de Verulamis, summi Angliæ Cancellarii Novum Organum, sine Judicia Verba de interpretatum naturæ.

THE NOVUM ORGANON; or, A True Guide to the Interpretation of Nature. By FRANCIS BACON, Lord Verulam, Lord Chancellor of England. A new Translation. By the Rev. G. W. KITCHIN, M.A. 8vo., cloth, 9*s.* 6*d.*

GAISFORD'S HEPHÆSTION. Hephæstionis Alexandrini Enchiridion, iterum edidit THOMAS GAISFORD, S.T.P., &c. Accedunt Terentianus Maurus de Syllabis et Metres, et Procli Chrestomathia Grammatica. 2 vols. 8vo., cloth, 1*l.* 5*s.*

XENOPHONTIS EXPEDITIO CYRI, ex recensione et cum annotationibus LUDOVICI DINDORFII. Editio Secunda, auctior et emendatior. 8vo., cloth, 10*s.* 6*d.*

LIDDELL AND SCOTT'S LEXICON. A Lexicon abridged from Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon. Fifth Edition. Cloth, 6*s.* 6*d.*

Date Due

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1137

5636

BS
2320
J77

AUTHOR
Jones, J. (Vol.3)

TITLE
Canonical auth. of the N.T.

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
SEP 28 '61	BASEMENT REPAIR vlm	vlm
NOV 19 '68	FRED Beutler TEDS NA	12.22